

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104

KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672

JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 280626

9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100

Irvine, California 92618

Telephone: (949) 379-6250

Facsimile: (949) 379-6251

Email: JCampbell@aegislawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Cassandra Hayes, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF MENDOCINO

CASSANDRA HAYES, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated

Plaintiff,

vs.

KEITH'S MEAT MARKET, INC.; and
DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
3. Failure to Permit Rest Breaks;
4. Unlawful Deductions;
5. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
6. Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Separation of Employment; and
7. Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Cassandra Hayes, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,
2 alleges as follows:

3 **NATURE OF ACTION AND INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff Cassandra Hayes (“Plaintiff”) brings this putative class action against
5 defendants Keith’s Meat Market, Inc., and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive (collectively,
6 “Defendants”), on behalf of herself individually and a putative class of non-exempt employees
7 employed by Defendants throughout California.

8 2. Defendants are in the grocery store industry.

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, all of which contribute to Defendants’ deliberate
12 unfair competition.

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

- 15 (a) Failing to pay overtime wages at the proper rates;
16 (b) Failing to provide meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
17 (c) Failing to authorize or permit rest breaks or provide compensation in lieu thereof;
18 (d) making improper deductions from employees’ earned wages;
19 (e) Failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
20 (f) Failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.

21 5. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking monetary relief against Defendants on
22 behalf of herself and all others similarly situated in California to recover, among other things,
23 unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses and penalties pursuant
24 to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 223, 224, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, and
25 1198.

26 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

27 6. This is a class action, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The
28 monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits

1 of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

14 **THE PARTIES**

15 10. Plaintiff is a citizen of California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants during
16 the Class Period in California.

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

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

25 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant acted
26 in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendant, carried out a joint
27 scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant
28 are legally attributable to the other defendant. Furthermore, defendants in all respects acted as

1 the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the class members.

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

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

11 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said
12 Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently or otherwise responsible for the acts,
13 omissions, occurrences and transactions alleged herein.

14 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

15 17. Plaintiff brings this action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of
16 herself and all others similarly situated who were affected by Defendants' Labor Code,
17 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 and IWC Wage Order violations.

18 18. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks
19 relief authorized by California law.

20 19. Plaintiff's proposed Class consists of and is defined as follows:

21 Class

22 All California citizens currently or formerly employed as non-exempt employees
23 by Defendants in the State of California from December 28, 2016¹ to the date of
class certification.

24 20. Plaintiff also seeks to certify the following Subclass of employees:

25 Waiting Time Subclass

26 All members of the Class who separated their employment from Defendants from
December 28, 2017 to the date of class certification.

27 ¹ The statute of limitations for this matter was tolled pursuant to Cal. Rules of Court, Appendix I,
28 Emergency Rule No. 9.

1 21. Members of the Class and Subclass described above will be collectively referred
2 to as “class members.” Plaintiff reserves the right to establish other or additional subclasses, or
3 modify any Class or Subclass definition, as appropriate based on investigation, discovery and
4 specific theories of liability.

5 22. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
6 under the California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there are common questions of law
7 and fact as to the Class that predominate over questions affecting only individual members
8 including, but not limited to:

- 9 (a) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and class members overtime compensation at
10 the proper rates;
- 11 (b) Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and class members of timely meal periods;
- 12 (c) Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and class members of rest breaks;
- 13 (d) Whether Defendants made unlawful deductions from Plaintiff’s and class
14 members’ wages;
- 15 (e) Whether Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and former class members all
16 wages due upon termination or within 72 hours of resignation;
- 17 (f) Whether Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and class members with accurate,
18 itemized wage statements; and
- 19 (g) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of Business
20 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

21 23. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the Class is
22 readily ascertainable:

- 23 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all
24 members is impractical. Although the members of the Class are unknown
25 to Plaintiff at this time, on information and belief, the Class is estimated to
26 be greater than 100 individuals. The identity of the class members are
27 readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants’ employment and payroll
28 records.

1 (b) Typicality: The claims (or defenses, if any) of Plaintiff are typical of the
2 claims (or defenses, if any) of the Class because Defendants' failure to
3 comply with the provisions of California wage and hour laws entitled each
4 class member to similar pay, benefits and other relief. The injuries
5 sustained by Plaintiff are also typical of the injuries sustained by the Class
6 because they arise out of and are caused by Defendants' common course of
7 conduct as alleged herein.

8 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will fairly and adequately represent
9 and protect the interests of all members of the Class because it is in her best
10 interest to prosecute the claims alleged herein to obtain full compensation
11 and penalties due to him and the Class. Plaintiff's attorneys, as proposed
12 class counsel, are competent and experienced in litigating large
13 employment class actions and are versed in the rules governing class action
14 discovery, certification and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred and,
15 throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur attorneys' fees
16 and costs that have been and will be necessarily expended for the
17 prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

18 (d) Superiority: The nature of this action makes the use of class action
19 adjudication superior to other methods. A class action will achieve
20 economies of time, effort and expense as compared with separate lawsuits,
21 and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can be
22 adjudicated in the same manner and at the same time for each Class. If
23 appropriate this Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods to
24 efficiently manage this case as a class action.

25 (e) Public Policy Considerations: Employers in the State of California and
26 other states violate employment and labor laws every day. Current
27 employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or
28 indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions

1 because they believe their former employers might damage their future
2 endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions
3 provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a
4 type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the
5 same time as affording them privacy protections.

6 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

7 24. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other
8 persons as non-exempt employees.

9 25. Plaintiff was employed in a non-exempt position at Defendants' California
10 business location(s).

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

12 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
13 mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees and other professionals
14 who were knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel
15 practices and the requirements of California law.

16 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants
17 improperly calculated the overtime rate of pay for Plaintiff and Class Members because the
18 rates did not include non-discretionary wages, including, but not limited to, bonuses, hazard
19 pay, and/or other incentive pay into the computation of their regular rate of pay for purposes of
20 calculating the overtime rate of pay.

21 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
22 should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive all required meal
23 periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and class members' regular
24 rate of pay when they did not receive a timely meal period. In violation of the Labor Code and
25 IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and class members did not receive all timely meal periods or
26 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and class members' regular rate of pay
27 when they did not receive a timely meal period.

28 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or

1 should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive all rest breaks or
2 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and class members' regular rate of pay
3 when a rest break was missed. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff
4 and class members did not receive all rest breaks or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay
5 at Plaintiff and class members' regular rate of pay when a rest break was missed.

6 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
7 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to all earned wages without
8 unlawful deductions. In violation of the California Labor Code, Defendants made unlawful
9 deductions from Plaintiff's and Class Members' wages.

10 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
11 should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive itemized wage
12 statements that accurately showed their gross and net wages earned, and the number of hours
13 worked at each hourly rate in accordance with California law. In violation of the Labor Code,
14 Plaintiff and class members were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

15 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
16 should have known that Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members were entitled to timely
17 payment of wages due upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code,
18 Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members did not receive payment of all wages within
19 permissible time periods.

20 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
21 should have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and class members, and Defendants
22 had the financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly and intentionally
23 failed to do so all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

26 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 3)**

27 35. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
28 though fully set forth herein.

1 36. Labor Code § 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that it is
2 unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either one and one-half
3 or two times the person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the
4 person on a daily or weekly basis.

5 37. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194, during the relevant time
6 period, Defendants were required to compensate Plaintiff and class members for all overtime
7 hours worked, calculated at one and one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for hours
8 worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week and for the first
9 eight (8) hours of the seventh consecutive work day, with double time after eight (8) hours on
10 the seventh day of any work week, or after twelve (12) hours in any work day.

11 38. Plaintiff and class members were non-exempt employees entitled to the
12 protections of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194.

13 39. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class
14 members overtime wages at the correct rate because they failed to include non-discretionary
15 wages, including, but not limited to, bonuses, hazard pay, and/or other incentive pay in the
16 computation of their overtime rate of pay, which caused Plaintiff and Class Members to not be
17 paid all overtime wages owed.

18 40. In violation of state law, Defendants have knowingly and willfully refused to
19 perform their obligations and compensate Plaintiff and class members for all wages earned as
20 alleged above.

21 41. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and class members the unpaid balance of
22 overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of Labor Code
23 §§ 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

24 42. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to
25 recover their unpaid overtime compensation as well as interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

26 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

28 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 11)**

1 43. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
2 though fully set forth herein.

3 44. Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work
4 during any meal period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

5 45. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states, “no employer shall employ
6 any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than
7 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the
8 day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the
9 employee.”

10 46. Labor Code § 512(a) provides that an employer may not require, cause or permit
11 an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the
12 employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if
13 the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period
14 may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

15 47. Labor Code § 512(a) also provides that an employer may not employ an
16 employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
17 with a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours
18 worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual
19 consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

20 48. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members did not receive
21 compliant meal periods for each five hours worked per day.

22 49. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order require
23 an employer to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of
24 compensation for each work day that a meal period is not provided.

25 50. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members meal
26 period premiums for meal period violations pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 11
27 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

28 51. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and class members an

1 additional hour of pay for each day a meal period was not provided, Plaintiff and class members
2 suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

3 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO PERMIT REST BREAKS**

5 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 12)**

6 52. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
7 though fully set forth herein.

8 53. Labor Code § 226.7(a) provides that no employer shall require an employee to
9 work during any rest period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

10 54. Section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states “every employer shall
11 authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in
12 the middle of each work period” and the “authorized rest period time shall be based on the total
13 hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major
14 fraction thereof” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

15 55. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members did not receive a ten
16 (10) minute rest period for every four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked.

17 56. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order
18 requires an employer to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular
19 rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.

20 57. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members rest
21 period premiums for rest period violations pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 12 of
22 the applicable IWC Wage Order.

23 58. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and class members an
24 additional hour of pay for each day a rest period was not provided, Plaintiff and class members
25 suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

26 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **UNLAWFUL DEDUCTIONS FROM EARNED WAGES**

28 **(Violation of Labor Code § 221, 223, 224; Violation of IWC Wage Order)**

59. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

60. Labor Code § 221 provides that employers may not collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee. Labor Code § 223 provides that where a contract requires an employer to maintain the designated wage scale, it is unlawful to pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage designated by contract. Labor Code § 224 prohibits employers from making deductions from an employee's wages not authorized by the employee in writing or permitted by law.

61. During the relevant time period, Defendants had a policy and practice of making unlawful deductions from earned wages of Plaintiff and Class Members.

62. As a result of Defendants' failure to refrain from making improper deductions from earned wages, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation, the exact amount of damages and/or penalties is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

(Violation of Labor Code § 226)

63. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

64. Labor Code § 226(a) requires Defendants to provide each employee with an accurate wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable

1 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at
2 each hourly rate by the employee.

3 65. During the relevant time period, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally
4 failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) on wage statements that were provided to Plaintiff
5 and class members. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly state
6 accurate inclusive dates of the pay period for Plaintiff and class members.

7 66. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff
8 and class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.
9 Specifically, Plaintiff and class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional
10 violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to
11 receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate itemized wage statements under
12 California Labor Code § 226(a). Plaintiff has had to file this lawsuit in order to determine the
13 extent of the underpayment of wages, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses and lost time.
14 Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had Defendants
15 provided the accurate wages earned. This has also delayed Plaintiff's ability to demand and
16 recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

17 67. California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to pay the greater of all
18 actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred,
19 and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods,
20 plus attorney's fees and costs, to each employee who was injured by the employer's failure to
21 comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

22 68. Defendants' violations of California Labor Code § 226(a) prevented Plaintiff
23 and class members from knowing, understanding and disputing the wages paid to them, and
24 resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a result of Defendants'
25 knowing and intentional failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and
26 class members have suffered an injury, and the exact amount of damages and/or penalties is all
27 in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

28 69. Plaintiff and class members are also entitled to injunctive relief under California

1 Labor Code § 226(h), compelling Defendants to comply with California Labor Code § 226, and
2 seek the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in obtaining this injunctive relief.

3 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE UPON SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT AND**
5 **WITHIN THE REQUIRED TIME**

6 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203)**

7 70. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
8 though fully set forth herein.

9 71. California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an
10 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
11 immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his employment, his wages shall
12 become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee
13 has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his intention to quit, in which case the
14 employee is entitled to his wages at the time of quitting.

15 72. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and
16 Waiting Time Subclass members all their earned wages upon termination including, but not
17 limited to, proper minimum wages and overtime compensation, either at the time of discharge
18 or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

19 73. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members all
20 their earned wages at the time of discharge or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving
21 Defendants' employ is in violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

22 74. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
23 wages owed immediately upon discharge or resignation in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201
24 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date at the
25 same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more
26 than thirty (30) days.

27 75. Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members are entitled to recover from
28 Defendants the statutory penalty which is defined as Plaintiff's and Waiting Time Subclass

1 members' regular daily wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of
2 pay, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17200, ET SEQ.**

5 76. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
6 though fully set forth herein.

7 77. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair,
8 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff and class members. Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights
9 affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

10 78. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, violate California law and constitute
11 unlawful business acts or practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code
12 §§ 17200, *et seq.*

13 79. A violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
14 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law.

15 80. Defendants' policies and practices have violated state law in at least the
16 following respects:

- 17 (a) Failing to pay all overtime wages at the proper rate to Plaintiff and class
18 members in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198;
- 19 (b) Failing to provide timely meal periods without paying Plaintiff and class
20 members premium wages for every day said meal periods were not
21 provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- 22 (c) Failing to authorize or permit rest breaks without paying Plaintiff and
23 class members premium wages for every day said rest breaks were not
24 authorized or permitted in violation of Labor Code § 226.7;
- 25 (d) Failing to refrain from making unlawful deductions from wages in
26 violation of Labor Code §§ 221, 223, and 224.
- 27 (e) Failing to provide Plaintiff and class members with accurate itemized
28 wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226; and

1 (e) Failing to timely pay all earned wages to Plaintiff and Waiting Time
2 Subclass members upon separation of employment in violation of Labor
3 Code §§ 201, 202 and 203.

4 81. Defendants intentionally avoided paying Plaintiff and class members' wages and
5 monies, thereby creating for Defendants an artificially lower cost of doing business in order to
6 undercut their competitors and establish and gain a greater foothold in the marketplace.

7 82. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* Plaintiff and class
8 members are entitled to restitution of the wages unlawfully withheld and retained by
9 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of the Complaint; an
10 award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable
11 laws; and an award of costs.

12 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

13 Plaintiff, on her own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, pray for relief
14 and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

15 1. For certification of this action as a class action, including certifying the Class
16 and Subclass alleged by Plaintiff;

17 2. For appointment of Cassandra Hayes as the class representatives;

18 3. For appointment of Aegis Law Firm, PC as class counsel for all purposes;

19 4. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof with interest
20 thereon;

21 5. For economic and/or special damages in an amount according to proof with
22 interest thereon;

23 6. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit and interest to the extent permitted
24 by law, including pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 Labor Code §§ 226(e) and
25 1194;

26 7. For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant
27 to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

28 8. For restitution as provided by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

1 9. For an order requiring Defendants to restore and disgorge all funds to each
2 employee acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, unfair
3 or fraudulent and, therefore, constituting unfair competition under Business and Professions
4 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

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

7 11. For pre-judgment interest; and

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

9
10 Dated: June 23, 2021

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

11 By: 

12 Jessica L. Campbell
13 Attorneys for Plaintiff Cassandra Hayes

14 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable of right by jury.

16
17 Dated: June 23, 2021

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

18
19 By: 

20 Jessica L. Campbell
21 Attorneys for Plaintiff Cassandra Hayes