

EDWIN AIWAZIAN (SBN 232943)
edwin@calljustice.com
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

HEATHER DAVIS, SBN 239372
heather@protectionlawgroup.com
AMIR NAYEBDADASH, SBN 232204
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
D. LUKE CLAPP, SBN 306040
luke@protectionlawgroup.com
PROTECTION LAW GROUP, LLP
237 California Street
El Segundo, California 90245
Telephone: (424) 290-3095
Facsimile: (866) 264-7880

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ROBERTO RIVERA

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

ROBERTO RIVERA, individually and on
behalf of others similarly situated, and as an
aggrieved employee and Private Attorney
General,

Plaintiff,

vs.

J. B. WHOLESALE ROOFING AND
BUILDING SUPPLIES, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 21TRCV00503

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION
AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

- (1) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)**
- (2) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums)**
- (3) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums)**
- (4) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages)**
- (5) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid)**
- (6) Violation of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment)**

- (7) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a) (Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements)**
- (8) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses)**
- (9) Violation of California Labor Code §1174(d) (Failure to Keep Requisite Payroll Records)**
- (10) Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.**
- (11) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 2699, (Private Attorneys General Act)**

1 Plaintiff ROBERTO RIVERA (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of other members
2 of the general public similarly situated as putative class members, and as a private attorney
3 general, based upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary
4 support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant J. B. WHOLESALE ROOFING
7 AND BUILDING SUPPLIES, INC. and DOES 1 THROUGH 100 (hereinafter also collectively
8 referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations, unfair business practices, and
9 civil penalties stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay overtime compensation, failure to
10 provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to pay minimum wage,
11 failure to timely pay wages, failure to provide accurate wage statements, failure to maintain
12 accurate time and payroll records, failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses,
13 failure to pay reporting wages, failure to pay prevailing wages.

14 2. Plaintiff’s First through Tenth Causes of Action are brought as a class action on
15 behalf of himself and similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter
16 collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” as defined more fully in paragraph
17 14, below) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages
18 and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court
19 and will be established according to proof at trial.

20 3. Plaintiff’s Eleventh Cause of Action is brought as a representative action on behalf
21 of himself and certain other current and former employees of Defendants against whom one or
22 more of the alleged violations was committed (hereinafter collectively referred to as the
23 “Aggrieved Employees”) pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* Plaintiff is an
24 aggrieved employee against whom one or more of the alleged violations occurred. The civil
25 penalties sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will
26 be established according to proof at trial.

27 4. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
28

Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

5. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants 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.

6. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff ROBERTO RIVERA is an individual residing in California.

8. Defendant J. B. WHOLESALE ROOFING AND BUILDING SUPPLIES, INC, is and at all times herein mentioned was and is upon information and belief, a California corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, and registered to do business in the state of California, and at all times herein mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

9. At all relevant times, Defendant J. B. WHOLESALE ROOFING AND BUILDING SUPPLIES, INC. was the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes.

10. Plaintiff is ignorant of the identities of defendants Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. The Doe defendants may be individuals, partnerships, or corporations. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that, at all times mentioned herein, each of the Doe defendants was the parent, subsidiary, agent, servant, employee, co-venturer, and/or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and was at all times mentioned acting within the scope, purpose, consent, knowledge, ratification and

1 authorization of such agency, employment, joint venture and conspiracy. Plaintiff will amend this
2 Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and
3 believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Doe defendants is responsible in
4 some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that Plaintiff's damages as herein alleged
5 were proximately caused by its conduct.

6 11. Defendants are and at all times herein mentioned were, (a) conducting business in
7 the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and (b) the employer of Plaintiff consistent with
8 the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("Wage Orders").

9 12. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants, directly or indirectly controlled or
10 affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of
11 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees so as to make each of said Defendants
12 employers and employers jointly liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

13 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

14 13. Plaintiff brings the First through Ninth Causes of Action as a class action on his
15 own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus,
16 seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

17 14. The proposed class is defined as follows: All current and former non-exempt
18 employees of Defendant J. B. WHOLESALE ROOFING AND BUILDING SUPPLIES, INC.
19 within the State of California at any time from May 6, 2020 to July 26, 2022 (hereinafter referred
20 to as the "Class" or "Class Members.").

21 15. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish other subclasses as appropriate.

22 16. The Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the
23 litigation:

- 24 a. Numerosity: The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all Class
25 Members is impracticable. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to
26 Plaintiff at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be over fifty (50)
27 individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by
28

inspection of Defendants' employment records.

- b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other Class Members demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other Class Members with whom he has a well-defined community of interest.
- c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member, with whom he has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other Class Members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each Class Member.
- d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all Class Members is impractical.
- e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the Class Members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

17. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the Class:

- a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement, or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code was willful;

- 1 b. Whether Defendants had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff
2 and the other Class Members for all hours worked, and missed, short, late or
3 interrupted meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- 4 c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work more
5 than eight (8) hours per day and/or more than forty (40) hours per week and failed
6 to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other Class
7 Members;
- 8 d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other Class Members of meal
9 and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work
10 during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- 11 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay meal period premium wages to Class Members
12 when they were not provided with a legally compliant meal period;
- 13 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay rest period premium wages to Class Members
14 when they were not authorized and permitted to take legally compliant rest
15 periods;
- 16 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other Class
17 Members for all hours worked;
- 18 h. Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the
19 required minimum wage pursuant to California law;
- 20 i. Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members proper
21 overtime compensation pursuant to California law;
- 22 j. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class
23 Members within the time required upon their discharge or resignation from
24 employment;
- 25 k. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members
26 for all necessary business-related expenses and costs in violation of California
27 Labor Code section 2802;
- 28

- 1 l. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other
2 Class Members during their employment;
- 3 m. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California
4 Labor Code, including section 226;
- 5 n. Whether Defendants' conduct was with malice, fraud or oppression;
- 6 o. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- 7 p. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
8 California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* based on their
9 improper withholding of compensation and deduction of wages;
- 10 q. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties
11 resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- 12 r. Whether Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to compensatory
13 damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

14 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

15 18. Defendant J.B. Wholesale Roofing and Building Supplies, Inc. is a California
16 corporation and is a distributor of residential & commercial roofing and other related products
17 throughout Southern California.

18 19. Defendants employed Plaintiff to work as an Inside Sales Representative from
19 approximately October 2019 to February 2020.¹

20 20. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff, the Class,
21 and the Aggrieved Employees as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees.

22 21. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants had the authority to
23 hire and terminate Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees; to directly or indirectly
24 control work rules, working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of
25 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees; and to hire and terminate the employment of

26
27 ¹ Pursuant to the Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19, Rule 9 (a), the statutes of limitation and repose for civil
28 causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020, until October 1, 2020.

1 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

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

4 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants engaged in
5 an ongoing and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt
6 employees. As set forth in more detail below, this scheme involved, *inter alia*, regularly requiring
7 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock without compensation,
8 thereby failing to pay them for all hours worked, including minimum and overtime wages. In
9 addition, Defendants routinely failed to permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
10 to take timely and duty-free meal periods and rest periods in violation of California law.
11 Defendants also failed to reimburse Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all
12 necessary business-related expenses.

13 24. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants routinely required
14 Plaintiff and other employees to perform work off-the-clock without compensation. While
15 Defendants claim they do not permit off-the-clock work, this policy was ignored and trumped by
16 Defendants' practice of requiring its employees to complete all of their work within their
17 scheduled shift and pressuring its employees to work off-the-clock if they could not do so.
18 Defendants' policies encouraged such off-the-clock work by requiring overtime to be approved
19 in advance and punishing employees who worked unauthorized overtime.

20 25. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented
21 policies and practices which failed to incorporate the total earnings, including but not limited to
22 bonuses, commissions and other non-discretionary payments, of Plaintiff, the Class, and the
23 Aggrieved Employees in their regular rate of pay when paying employees overtime and have
24 failed to report employees correct overtime rate of pay on employee wage statements.

25 26. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented
26 policies and practices which failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
27 with timely and duty-free meal periods. Defendants routinely failed to relieve Plaintiff, the Class,
28

1 and the Aggrieved Employees of all duties during their meal periods, regularly failed to relinquish
2 control over Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees during their meal periods,
3 regularly failed to permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees a reasonable
4 opportunity to take their meal periods, and regularly impeded or discouraged Plaintiff, the Class,
5 and the Aggrieved Employees from taking thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks no later
6 than the end of their fifth hour of work and/or from taking a second thirty (30) minute
7 uninterrupted meal break no later than their tenth hour of work for shifts lasting more than ten
8 (10) hours. Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of meal periods taken by Plaintiff,
9 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

10 27. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants did not adequately
11 inform Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take meal periods under
12 California law. Moreover, Defendants systematically disregarded their own written policies
13 regarding the provision and timing of meal periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
14 Employees. Instead, Defendants' actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiff, the Class,
15 and the Aggrieved Employees in a way that prohibited them from taking timely and duty-free
16 meal periods, and to require Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work through
17 their meal periods, for which they were not compensated.

18 28. Throughout the time period involved in this case Plaintiff, the Class, and the
19 Aggrieved Employees were not allowed to leave during their meal periods but were required to
20 remain on site by their supervisors so as to not "waste time". Throughout the time period involved
21 in this case the meal periods of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were frequently
22 missed, late or interrupted due to staffing issues.

23 29. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay
24 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for meal periods that were
25 missed, late, interrupted, or shortened in violation of California law. Defendants knew or should
26 have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all
27 meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a meal
28

1 period was missed, short, late, and/or interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants
2 routinely failed to provide legally compliant meal periods to Plaintiff, the Class, and the
3 Aggrieved Employees, and routinely failed to pay one additional hour of pay to Plaintiff, the
4 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed,
5 short, late, and/or interrupted.

6 30. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented
7 policies and practices which prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from
8 taking timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants regularly failed to provide, authorize, and
9 permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take full, uninterrupted, off-duty rest
10 periods for every shift lasting three and one-half (3.5) to six (6) hours and/or two full,
11 uninterrupted, off-duty rest periods for every shift lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours, and failed to
12 make a good faith effort to authorize, permit, and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each
13 work period.

14 31. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants did not adequately
15 inform Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take rest periods under
16 California law. Moreover, Defendants systematically disregarded their own written policies
17 regarding the provision and timing of rest periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
18 Employees. Instead, Defendants' actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiff, the Class,
19 and the Aggrieved Employees in a way that regularly prohibited them from taking timely and
20 duty free rest periods, and to regularly require Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
21 to work through their rest periods.

22 32. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay
23 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for rest periods that were
24 missed, late, interrupted, or shortened in violation of California law. Defendants knew or should
25 have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all
26 rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period
27 was missed, short, late, and/or interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants routinely
28

1 failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take duty-free
2 rest periods, and failed to pay one additional hour of pay to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
3 Employees at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, short, late and/or
4 interrupted.

5 33. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly required
6 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work off the clock. Although
7 Defendants prohibited overtime, Defendants still regularly required that Plaintiff, the Class, and
8 the Aggrieved Employees complete all of their assigned duties. To do so, Plaintiff, the Class, and
9 the Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to perform work off the clock for which they
10 were not compensated.

11 34. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants implemented policies
12 that prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from accurately recording the
13 actual time worked, resulting in a failure to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
14 all wages owed.

15 35. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Plaintiff, the Class, and the
16 Aggrieved Employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a
17 week.

18 36. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
19 pay all overtime compensation owed to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees when
20 they worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a single work day and/or forty (40) hours in a single
21 work week, or in excess of twelve (12) hours in a single work day and/or eighty (80) hours in a
22 single work week. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the
23 Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that
24 they were not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

25 37. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay
26 overtime to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked
27 based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.
28

1 38. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
2 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at least minimum wages for all hours
3 worked. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
4 Employees were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for all hours worked and that they
5 were not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked. Defendants' failure to pay
6 minimum wages included, *inter alia*, failing to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
7 Employees at the required minimum wage pursuant to California law, requiring Plaintiff, the
8 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work off the clock.

9 39. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
10 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or
11 resignation. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
12 Employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them upon termination within the time
13 permissible under California Labor Code section 202. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
14 Employees did not receive payment of all final wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation,
15 including overtime compensation and minimum wages within any time permissible under
16 California Labor Code section 202.

17 40. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
18 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages within any time permissible
19 under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204. Defendants knew
20 or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to
21 receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
22 Employees did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime compensation, minimum
23 wages, meal and rest period premiums.

24 41. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
25 provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
26 Employees. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
27 Employees were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with
28

1 California law, but, in fact, they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from
2 Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours
3 worked, the actual gross wages earned, the correct rates of pay, net wages earned, and all
4 applicable hourly rates.

5 42. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
6 keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.
7 Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants were required to keep complete and
8 accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with
9 California law, but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

10 43. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
11 maintain accurate records relating to Plaintiff's, the Class's, and the Aggrieved Employees' work
12 periods, meal periods, total daily hours, hours per pay period, and applicable pay rates.

13 44. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to reimburse
14 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses,
15 including but not limited to: the use of personal cell phones, use of personal vehicles and purchase
16 of steel-toed shoes. Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants were required to
17 reimburse Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related
18 expenses and costs, but, in fact, failed to do so in violation of California law.

19 45. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants knew or should have
20 known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
21 pursuant to California law. Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but
22 willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff, the
23 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees that they paid all wages owed to them, all in order to increase
24 Defendants' profits.

25 46. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor
26 Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly ... for any wages or penalty due
27 to him [or her] under this article."
28

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
5 every allegation set forth above.

6 48. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare
7 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without
8 compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular
9 rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

10 49. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and
11 were required to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members employed by Defendants, and working
12 more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of
13 time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty
14 (40) hours in a workweek.

15 50. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were
16 required to pay Plaintiff and the Class overtime compensation at a rate of two times their regular
17 rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and for all hours worked
18 in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

19 51. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at
20 one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a
21 day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of
22 work, and no overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess
23 of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

24 52. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members regularly
25 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

26 53. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to
27 pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other Class Members.
28

54. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed incorporate all total earnings, including but not limited to bonuses, commissions and other non-discretionary payments, of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in their regular rate of pay when calculating employees overtime earnings and as a result failed to pay employees all overtime wages owed.

55. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

56. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))

(Against All Defendants)

57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above.

58. At all relevant times, the relevant IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

59. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

60. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of

1 both the employer and employee.

2 61. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 512(a) further provides that
3 an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more
4 than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal
5 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than
6 twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and
7 the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

8 62. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were
9 scheduled to work for a period of time longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their
10 legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than
11 five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

12 63. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were
13 scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of ten (10) hours were required to work for
14 periods longer than ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than
15 thirty (30) minutes.

16 64. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required
17 Plaintiff and the other Class Members to miss their meal periods and to take meal periods that
18 were late, shortened, or interrupted, and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other Class
19 Members the full meal period premium for missed, shortened, late, or interrupted meal periods.

20 65. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other
21 Class Members the full meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code section
22 226.7.

23 66. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California
24 Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

25 67. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section
26 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
27 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the
28

meal period was not provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)

(Against All Defendants)

68. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above.

69. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

70. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

71. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3.5) hours."

72. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and other Class Members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

73. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work during rest periods, failed to allow Plaintiff and the other Class Member to take any rest period and/or failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the other Class Members to take uninterrupted, duty-free rest breaks including by failing to authorize employees to leave the premises during their rest periods and retaining direction and control over employees during their rest periods.

1 74. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other
2 Class Members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7
3 for work performed during rest periods, and/or for failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and
4 other Class Members from taking uninterrupted rest periods.

5 75. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor
6 Code section 226.7.

7 76. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section
8 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
9 additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day
10 that the rest period was not provided.

11 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)**

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 77. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
15 every allegation set forth above.

16 78. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1
17 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees and the payment of a lesser wage than
18 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

19 79. During the relevant time period, Defendants regularly failed to pay minimum wage
20 to Plaintiff and the other Class Members as required pursuant to California Labor Code sections
21 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

22 80. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the minimum
23 wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to
24 those sections, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance
25 of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees, and liquidated
26 damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

27 81. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other Class
28

Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203)

(Against All Defendants)

82. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above.

83. At all relevant times herein set forth, California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

84. During the relevant time period, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Class Members with Defendants ended, *i.e.* was terminated by quitting or discharge. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and other Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants all of their wages, earned and unpaid, including but not limited to minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

85. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and other Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

86. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

87. Plaintiff and other Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants are

entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 204 and 210)

(Against All Defendants)

88. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above

89. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

90. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

91. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

92. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and other Class Members all wages due to them, within any time period permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

93. Plaintiff and other Class Members are entitled to recover all available remedies for Defendants' violations of California Labor Code section 204, including statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 210(b).

///

///

///

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))
(Against All Defendants)

95. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

97. Because of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

98. More specifically, Plaintiff and the Class have been injured by Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were

1 denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and
2 itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

3 99. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their
4 actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code section
5 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

6 100. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance
7 with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

8 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)**

10 **(Against All Defendants)**

11 101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
12 every allegation set forth above.

13 102. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must
14 reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
15 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her job
16 duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

17 103. Plaintiff and the Class incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that
18 were not fully reimbursed by Defendants. Defendants' failure to reimburse for all necessary
19 business-related expenses and costs included their failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for
20 costs incurred as a result of, including but not limited to, simple negligence.

21 104. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the
22 Class for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to
23 recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and
24 scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred
25 the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d))**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 100. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
5 every allegation set forth above.

6 101. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d), an employer shall keep, at a
7 central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed,
8 payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-
9 rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective
10 plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this
11 purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than two years.

12 102. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete
13 payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Plaintiff and the other class
14 members.

15 103. As a result of Defendants violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d),
16 Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected
17 rights.

18 104. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by
19 Defendants intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) because
20 they were denied both their legal right and protected interest, in having available, accurate and
21 complete payroll records pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d).

22 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)**

24 **(Against All Defendants)**

25 105. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
26 every allegation set forth above.

27 106. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
28

1 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff and the Class, to the general public, and Defendants'
2 competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest
3 within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

4 107. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
5 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
6 Code section 17200, *et seq.*

7 108. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* may
8 be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies
9 and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the Class, to work overtime without
10 paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.
11 Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and
12 the Class, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation
13 violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policies and
14 practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the Class violate California Labor Code
15 sections 201, 202, 203 and 204.

16 109. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 221, 226(a), 1194, 1197,
17 1197.1, 510, 1174(d), 2800, and 2802.

18 110. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants
19 unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

20 111. Plaintiff and the Class have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful
21 business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of
22 money and/or property.

23 112. Plaintiff and the Class have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful
24 business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of
25 money and/or property.

26 113. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*,
27 Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants
28

1 during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this Complaint; an award of
2 attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable
3 laws; and an award of costs

4 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 2699, Et Seq.)**

6 **(Against All Defendants)**

7 114. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
8 every allegation set forth above.

9 115. Plaintiff brings his tenth cause of action as a representative action on behalf of
10 himself and similarly Aggrieved Employees in the capacity as a private attorney general pursuant
11 to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*
12 (“PAGA”).

13 116. PAGA specifically provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties
14 for violations of the Labor Code as follows: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any
15 provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
16 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
17 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through
18 a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current
19 or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.” Cal. Lab. Code §
20 2699(a).

21 117. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the Labor Code violations alleged above
22 were committed against him during his time of employment. Plaintiff is therefore, an “aggrieved
23 employee” under PAGA.

24 118. As set forth in detail above, during all times relevant to this Action, Defendants
25 have routinely subjected Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to violations of California Labor
26 Codes by:

27 a. Failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned minimum wage
28

1 compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 *et seq.*

2 b. Failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime
3 compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198 *et seq.*

4 c. Failing to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
5 Employees, and failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees an additional
6 hour of premium pay for meal period violations in violation of Labor Code §§
7 226.7 and 512.

8 d. Failing to provide authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to
9 take duty-free rest periods, and failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
10 Employees an additional hour of premium pay for rest period violations in
11 violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

12 e. Failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages at the end
13 of their employment in violation of Labor Code § 203.

14 f. Failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed
15 during employment in violation of Labor Code § 204.

16 g. Failing to furnish Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate,
17 itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226.

18 h. Failing to maintain accurate records relating to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
19 Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours, hours per pay period,
20 total wages and compensation, and applicable pay rates in violation of Labor Code
21 § 1174(d) and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

22 i. Failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for necessary
23 business-related expenses in violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802.

24 119. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699 and 2699.5, Plaintiff,
25 individually and on behalf of the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California, requests and
26 is entitled to recover penalties against Defendants for the Labor Code violations described above,
27 including but not limited to penalties under California Code of Regulations, penalties under
28

1 California Labor Code sections 2699, 558, 210, 1197.1, 226, 226.3 and 1174.5, and 1197.1, and
2 any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other
3 statutes. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown
4 according to proof at trial.

5 120. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to Labor Code §
6 2699.3. On May 6, 2021, Plaintiff, through his counsel of record, by online filing with the Labor
7 and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to the Defendants, notified
8 Defendants and the LWDA of the specific provisions of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders
9 that Defendants have violated, including the facts and theories to support the violations, and of
10 Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under PAGA. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee
11 required under Labor Code § 2699.3. As of the filing of this Complaint, more than sixty-five (65)
12 days have elapsed since the mailing of Plaintiff’s May 6, 2021 notice, and the Labor and Workforce
13 Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate the violations discussed in the
14 notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties for himself and
15 other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3.

16 121. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to
17 protect his interests and the Aggrieved Employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties
18 owed by Defendants. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs
19 pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), and any other applicable statute.

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all other members of the general
22 public similarly situated, and as a private attorney general, prays for relief and judgment against
23 Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

24 **Class Certification**

- 25 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
- 26 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
- 27 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and

1 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most
2 current/last known contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class
3 members.

4 **As to the First Cause of Action**

5 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**

6 **(Against All Defendants)**

7 5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
8 Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay
9 all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and other Class Members;

10 6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special
11 damages as may be appropriate;

12 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
13 from the date such amounts were due;

14 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
15 California Labor Code section 1194; and

16 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

17 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

18 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))**

19 **(Against All Defendants)**

20 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
21 Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to
22 provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the Class;

23 11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the Class of one (1) hour of pay at
24 each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not
25 provided;

26 12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
27 proof;
28

- 1 13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7;
- 2 14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
- 3 due;
- 4 15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 5 16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

6 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

7 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)**

8 **(Against All Defendants)**

9 17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California

10 Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest

11 periods to Plaintiff and the Class;

12 18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the Class of one (1) hour of pay at

13 each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not

14 provided;

15 19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to

16 proof;

17 20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7;

18 21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were

19 due; and

20 22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

21 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

22 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)**

23 **(Against All Defendants)**

24 23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California

25 Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to

26 Plaintiff and the Class;

27 24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be

28

1 appropriate;

2 25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for
3 Plaintiff and the Class in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

4 26. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts
5 were due;

6 27. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
7 California Labor Code section 1194(a);

8 28. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

9 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

10 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

11 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203)**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
14 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the
15 time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and other Class Members no longer employed
16 by Defendants;

17 31. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
18 proof;

19 32. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for
20 Plaintiff and other Class Members who have left Defendants' employ;

21 33. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts
22 were due; and

23 34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

24 **As to the Sixth Cause of Action**

25 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 204 and 210)**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
28

Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiff and the Class;

36. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 210;

37. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))

(Against All Defendants)

38. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the Class, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

39. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

40. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e); and

41. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)

(Against All Defendants)

42. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

43. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

44. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

45. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

46. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

1 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action**

2 **(Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 47. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Anixter violated California Labor
5 Code section 1172(d) by willfully failing to keep accurate and complete payroll records for
6 Plaintiff Tamayo and the other class members as required by California Labor Code section
7 1174(d);

8 48. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
9 For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5; and

10 49. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper

11 **As to the Tenth Cause of Action**

12 **(Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)**

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 50. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
15 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiff and the Class
16 all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff
17 and the Class, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the Class, failing to pay
18 Plaintiff's and other Class Members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section
19 201, 202 and 204 and by violating California Labor Code sections 226(a), 227.3, 1174(d), 2800,
20 and 2802;

21 51. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and the Class and all pre-judgment
22 interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

23 52. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
24 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
25 Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200,
26 *et seq.*;

27 53. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
28

California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

54. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California

55. Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

56. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eleventh Cause of Action

(Violation of California Labor Code § 2699, Et Seq.)

(Against All Defendants)

57. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 2699(g)(1) of California Labor Code;

58. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, 210, 558, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and all other penalties allowed by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes; and

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

Dated: July 28, 2022

PROTECTION LAW GROUP, LLP

By: 

Heather Davis
Amir Nayebdadash
D. Luke Clapp

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ROBERTO RIVERA

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

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

Dated: July 28, 2022

PROTECTION LAW GROUP, LLP

By: _____

Heather Davis
Amir Nayebdadash
D. Luke Clapp

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ROBERTO RIVERA