

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Kevin Brazile

1 DAVID G. SPIVAK (SBN 179684)

david@spivaklaw.com

2 GREGORY WILBUR (SBN 295945)

greg@spivaklaw.com

3 MAYA CHEAITANI (SBN 335777)

maya@spivaklaw.com

4 THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

5 16530 Ventura Blvd., Suite 203

6 Encino, CA 91436

7 Telephone (213) 725-9094

Facsimile (213) 634-2485

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff,

9 AKANKSHA MASSEY, and all others similarly situated

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

12 **(UNLIMITED JURISDICTION)**

13 AKANKSHA MASSEY, as an “aggrieved
14 employee” on behalf of other similarly situated
15 “aggrieved employees” under the Labor Code
16 Private Attorney General Act of 2004,

17 *Plaintiff,*

18 vs.

19 CHILDREN OF THE NIGHT, INC., a California
20 corporation; and DOES 1–50, inclusive,

21 *Defendants.*

Case No.: 21STCV30464

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF
THE LABOR CODE AND CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004, LABOR
CODE §§ 2698, ET SEQ.**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

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

ADDITIONAL ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

WALTER HAINES (SBN 71075)
whaines@uelglaw.com
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP
4276 Katella Ave., #301
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
Tel.: (562) 256-1047
Fax: (562) 256-1006



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 Plaintiff, AKANKSHA MASSEY (hereafter “Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself, the State of
2 California, and other Aggrieved Employees, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **I. INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action based on alleged violations of the
5 California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 5-2001 (hereafter “the
6 Wage Order”), against Defendants CHILDREN OF THE NIGHT, INC., a California corporation,
and DOES 1-50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”).

7 2. As set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants are liable to
8 her, the State of California, and other similarly situated and aggrieved current and former
9 employees who worked in California as hourly, non-exempt employees, for civil penalties and
10 other related relief. These claims are based on Defendants’ failures to: (1) Provide all rest and
11 meal periods; (2) Indemnify for necessary work-related expenditures; (3) Pay all wages earned
12 for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay; (4) Issue accurate and complete itemized wage
13 statements; (5) Timely pay wages during and upon termination of employment and; (6) Maintain
14 accurate employment records. Accordingly, Plaintiff now seeks to recover civil penalties and
related relief through this representative action.

15 **II. THE PARTIES**

16 3. Plaintiff, an individual and resident of California, on approximately October 5,
17 2020, began working for Defendants at their headquarters located at 3450 Cahuenga Blvd W, Los
18 Angeles, California as a global tutor, a non-exempt, hourly position. Defendants continuously
19 employed her in that capacity until on or about November 17, 2020.

20 4. Defendant CHILDREN OF THE NIGHT, INC. is a corporation organized and
21 existing under the laws of California and also a citizen of California based on Plaintiff’s
22 information and belief.

23 5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extents of
24 participation in the conduct alleged herein of the Defendants sued as DOES 1-50, inclusive, but
25 is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said Defendants are legally responsible for the
26 wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names.
27 Plaintiff will amend the Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants
28 when ascertained.



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 **A. THE AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES**

2 6. The “Aggrieved Employees” are all individuals currently and formerly employed
3 by Defendants in California, as hourly, non-exempt employees, including, but not limited to
4 tutors, teachers, educators, and persons in comparable positions, at any time during the period of
June 11, 2020 and entry of judgment (“the PAGA Period”).

5 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
6 herein, all Defendants were the agents, employees and/or servants, masters or employers of the
7 remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course
8 and scope of such agency or employment, and with the approval and ratification of each of the
9 other Defendants.

10 8. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,
11 Defendants, and each of them, acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy, practice, or a lack
12 of a practice which resulted in Defendants not paying Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved
13 Employees in accordance with applicable California labor laws as alleged herein.

14 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each and every one of
15 the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, and/or attributable to, all Defendants,
16 each acting as agents and/or employees, and/or under the direction and control of each of the other
17 defendants, and that said acts and failures to act were within the course and scope of said agency,
employment, and/or direction and control.

18 **III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

19 10. On approximately October 5, 2020, Defendants employed Plaintiff at their
20 headquarters located at 3450 Cahuenga Blvd W, Los Angeles, California as a global tutor, an
21 hourly, non-exempt position. Defendants continuously employed her in that capacity until on or
22 about November 17, 2020 when her employment ended.

23 11. At all relevant times, Defendants issued wages to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved
24 Employees on a bi-weekly basis and paid them at an hourly rate of pay. At all relevant times,
25 Defendants classified Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees
entitled to the protections of both the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

26 12. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all
27 hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including overtime. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
28 Employees often worked five (5) to six (6) days in a workweek, and between four (4) and nine



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

(9) hours per workday. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked over eight (8) hours in one workday and over forty (40) hours in one workweek. Defendants, however, failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees overtime wages of at least one and a half 1½ times their hourly rates of pay for all hours in excess of forty (40) in a week, and all hours in excess of eight (8) in a day. Defendants intentionally failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours. Defendants advised Plaintiff that she had “not been approved for any of the above forementioned overtime.” However, Defendants frequently forced Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work overtime hours by assigning them more time-sensitive work than they could reasonably expect them to complete within their assigned shifts.

13. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all timely meal periods. Due to the workload Defendants denied Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. Defendants also denied meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants frequently required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to teach back-to-back classes without periods of rest between them.

14. Moreover, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with rest periods in violation of California law. Due to high workload and low staffing levels, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Defendants did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods. Defendants also failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with timely rest periods.

15. At all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. Defendants required Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees to use their personal mobile phones to communicate with students and co-workers and to coordinate their schedules with supervisors. Defendants did not offer mobile phones to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees for this purpose, nor did they reimburse them for use of their personal mobile phones.

16. Defendants failed to issue to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees complete and



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 accurate wage statements as a result of its failure to state all hours worked at the correct rates of
2 pay, and all wages earned including rest period and meal period premium wages. Defendants also
3 failed to timely pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned wages described above
4 during and at the conclusion of employment. Moreover, Defendants failed to maintain accurate
employee records of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

5 17. For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff alleges that as a result of Defendants'
6 unlawful practice and policies, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were:

- 7 A. Not provided with all off duty meal periods;
8 B. Not provided with all rest break periods as required by law;
9 C. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
10 provide them with one or more timely rest periods;
11 D. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
12 provide them with one or more timely meal periods;
13 E. Not paid all wages earned, including, but not limited to, regular and
14 overtime wages for work performed while clocked out;
15 F. Not indemnified for all necessary business expenditures incurred during
the discharge of their duties;
16 G. Not provided with accurate and complete wage statements; and
17 H. Not timely paid all earned and unpaid wages during their employment with
18 Defendants and at the time such employment ended.

19 **IV. FIRST (AND ONLY) CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **CIVIL PENALTIES**

21 **(Lab. Code §§ 2698, et seq.)**

22 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the other Aggrieved Employees, against**
23 **all Defendants)**

24 18. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

25 19. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been non-
26 exempt employees entitled to the protections of both the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

27 **A. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS AND MEAL PERIODS**

28 20. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

21. In relevant part, In relevant part, California Labor Code § 512 states:

An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

22. In relevant part, Section 12 of the Wage Order states:

Rest Periods

(A) “Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized 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. However, a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 1/2) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages.”

(B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.”

23. In relevant part, Section 11 of the Wage Order states:

Meal Periods

(A) “No employer shall employ any person for a work period



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

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

of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employee and the employer. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an 'on duty' meal period and counted as time worked. An 'on duty' meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time."

(B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal period is not provided."

24. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 226.7 states:

(b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

(c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

25. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512 and the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to uninterrupted meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each day they worked five or more hours. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512, they were also entitled to a second 30-minute meal period when they worked more than 10 hours in a workday.

26. Pursuant to the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be provided with net rest breaks of at least ten minutes for each four-hour period of work, or



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

major fraction thereof.

27. Defendants intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all required 30-minute duty free meal periods and 10-minute rest periods free from any work duties in accordance with the Wage Order.

28. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all timely rest and meal periods. Due to the workload and failure to hire sufficient staff members, Defendants denied Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work.. Defendants also denied meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants frequently required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to teach back to back classes without intervals. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods.

29. At all relevant times, due to high workload and low staffing levels, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Defendants did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Divisions of Labor Standards Enforcement. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages on workdays they failed to provide them with 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof.

30. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy which resulted in Defendants not providing the and the Aggrieved Employees with all off-duty meal periods and rest breaks required by California law.

B. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES EARNED FOR ALL HOURS WORKED AT THE CORRECT RATES OF PAY

31. Section 2 of the Wage Order defines “hours worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.”

32. Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

(A) Daily Overtime - General Provisions

(1) The following overtime provisions are applicable to employees 18 years of



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 age or over and to employees 16 or 17 years of age who are not required by law
2 to attend school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from engaging in the
3 subject work. Such employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in
4 any workday or more than 40 hours in any workweek unless the employee
5 receives one and one-half (1 ½) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all
6 hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek. Eight (8) hours of labor constitutes
7 a day's work. Employment beyond eight (8) hours in any workday or more than
8 six (6) days in any workweek is permissible provided the employee is
9 compensated for such overtime at not less than:

10 (a) One and one-half (1 ½) times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours
11 worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including 12 hours in any workday,
12 and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of
13 work in a workweek.

14 (b) Double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of
15 12 hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on
16 the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek.

17 (c) The overtime rate of compensation required to be paid to a nonexempt full-
18 time salaried employee shall be computed by using the employee's regular hourly
19 salary as one-fortieth (1/40) of the employee's weekly salary.

20 33. Section 4 of the Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt employees
21 at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consists of all hours that
22 an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

23 34. Labor Code section 510 states:

24 Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Any work in excess of eight hours
25 in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the
26 first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall
27 be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate
28 of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be
compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an
employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a
workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate
of pay of an employee. Nothing in this section requires an employer to combine
more than one rate of overtime compensation in order to calculate the amount to
be paid to an employee for any hour of overtime work.

35. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
employee to work for less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order.

36. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee
less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 during a payroll period.

2 37. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for an employer to employ an
3 employee under conditions that violate the Wage Order.

4 38. In conjunction, these provisions of the Labor Code require employers to pay non-
5 exempt employees no less than their agreed-upon or statutorily mandated wage rates for all hours
6 worked, including unrecorded hours when the employer knew or reasonably should have known
7 that employees were working during those hours. (See *Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.* (2000) 22
8 Cal.4th 575, 585.)

9 39. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants failed to
10 compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including, but not
11 limited to overtime wages for all overtime hours they worked at the correct rates of pay.

12 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
13 Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'
14 failure to compensate Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked as
15 required by California law.

16 **C. FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY**

17 41. In pertinent part, California Labor Code § 2802(a) states:

18 “An employer shall indemnify his or her employee[s] for all
19 necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
20 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

21 42. California Labor Code § 1198 prohibits employers from employing their
22 employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

23 43. At all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
24 to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. During the applicable
25 limitations period, Defendants required Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees to use their
26 personal mobile phones to communicate with students and co-workers and to coordinate their
27 schedules with supervisors. Defendants did not offer mobile phones to Plaintiff and the other
28 Aggrieved Employees for this purpose, nor did they reimburse them for use of their personal
mobile phones.

44. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'



1 failure to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the reasonable expenses they
2 incurred during the course of performing their duties.

3 **D. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE AND COMPLETE WRITTEN WAGE**
4 **STATEMENTS**

5 45. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
6 Employees were entitled to receive, bi-weekly or at the time of each payment of wages, an
7 accurate itemized statement showing: a) gross wages earned; b) net wages earned; c) all applicable
8 hourly rates in effect during the pay period; and d) the corresponding number of hours worked at
each hourly rate by the employee.

9 46. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, an employee is deemed to suffer injury
10 if the employer fails to provide a wage statement. Also, an employee is deemed to suffer injury if
11 the employer fails to provide accurate and complete information as required by California Labor
12 Code § 226(a) and the employee cannot “promptly and easily determine” from the wage statement
13 alone one or more of the following:

14 A. The amount of the gross wages or net wages paid to the employee during
15 the pay period or any of the other information required to be provided on the itemized wage
16 statement pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a);

17 B. Which deductions the employer made from gross wages to determine the
18 net wages paid to the employee during the pay period;

19 C. The name and address of the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor
20 contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682 of the California Labor Code, the name
and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer during the pay period;

21 D. The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or his social
22 security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; and

23 E. The number of piece-rate units earned and the piece rate.

24 47. “Promptly and easily determine,” as stated in California Labor Code § 226(e),
25 means a reasonable person would be able to readily ascertain the information without reference
26 to other documents or information.

27 48. As alleged herein, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
28 Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly and
accurately itemize each employee’s gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked,



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee and other requirements
2 of California Labor Code section 226. Defendants failed to state in the wage statements they
3 issued to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees all their hours worked and wages earned,
4 including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock
after clocking-out (as described above).

5 49. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with
6 accurate wage statements was knowing and intentional. Defendants had the ability to provide
7 Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with accurate wage statements but intentionally
8 provided wage statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

9 50. As a result of being provided with inaccurate wage statements by Defendants,
10 Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury. Their legal rights to receive
11 accurate wage statements were violated and they were misled about the amount of wages they
12 had actually earned and were owed. In addition, the absence of accurate information on their wage
13 statements prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required
14 discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed, has caused
15 difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records and/or has led to the
16 submission of inaccurate information about wages to state and federal government agencies.
17 Further, Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees were not able to ascertain from the wage
18 statements whether Defendants complied with their obligations under California Labor Code
section 226(a).

19 **E. UNTIMELY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT**

20 51. Labor Code § 204 states

21 (a) All wages, other than those mentioned in Section 201,
22 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any
23 employment are due and payable twice during each
24 calendar month, on days designated in advance by the
25 employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed
26 between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar
27 month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day
of the month during which the labor was performed, and
labor performed between the 16th and the last day,
inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. ...

28 (b) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 section, all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal
2 work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the
3 next regular payroll period.

4 (2) An employer is in compliance with the
5 requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 226 relating to
6 total hours worked by the employee, if hours worked in
7 excess of the normal work period during the current pay
8 period are itemized as corrections on the paystub for the
9 next regular pay period. Any corrections set out in a
10 subsequently issued paystub shall state the inclusive dates
11 of the pay period for which the employer is correcting its
12 initial report of hours worked.

13 (c) However, when employees are covered by a collective
14 bargaining agreement that provides different pay
15 arrangements, those arrangements shall apply to the
16 covered employees.

17 (d) The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied
18 by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or
19 semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than
20 seven calendar days following the close of the payroll
21 period.

22 52. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all
23 hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including overtime. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff
24 and the Aggrieved Employees with all meal and rest periods in compliance with California laws.
25 Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all premium wages
26 on workdays they failed to provide them with one or more meal or rest periods in compliance
27 with California laws. As a result, Defendants failed to timely pay all earned minimum, overtime,
28 and premium wages due during employment within the time periods set by California Labor Code
section 204.

29 **F. UNTIMELY FINAL WAGES**

30 53. Labor Code § 201 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who
31 is discharged are due and payable immediately at the time of discharge.

32 54. Labor Code § 202 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who
33 quits after providing at least 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable at the time of
34 quitting and that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who quits without providing at
35 least 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable within 72 hours.



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 55. By failing to pay earned minimum and premium wages to Plaintiff and the
2 Aggrieved Employees, Defendants failed to timely pay them all earned and unpaid wages in
3 violation of Labor Code § 201 or § 202.

4 56. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failures to timely pay Plaintiff
5 and the Aggrieved Employees all of their earned and unpaid wages (described above) have been
6 willful in that, at all relevant times, Defendants have deliberately maintained policies and
7 practices that violate the requirements of the Labor Code and the Wage Order, even though at all
8 relevant times, they have had the ability to comply with those legal requirements.

8 **G. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE EMPLOYMENT RECORDS**

9 57. Labor Code § 1174 states:

10 Every person employing labor in this state shall:

11 ...

12 (c) Keep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees
13 employed and the ages of all minors.

14 (d) Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments
15 at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked
16 daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by
17 and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective
18 plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules
19 established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept
20 on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an
21 employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on
22 a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned.

19 58. Labor Code § 1174.5 states:

20 Any person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records
21 required by subdivision (c) of Section 1174, or to allow any member of the
22 commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to
23 subdivision (b) of Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five
24 hundred dollars (\$500).

23 59. Section 7 of the Wage Order states,

24 (a) Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each
25 employee including the following:

- 26 1. Full name, home address, occupation, and social security number.
- 27 2. Birth date, if under 18 years, and designation as a minor.
- 28 3. Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each
work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily
hours worked shall also be recorded. Meal periods during which
operations cease and authorized rest periods need not be recorded.



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

4. Total wages paid each payroll period, including value of board, lodging, or other compensation actually furnished to the employee.
5. Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay. This information shall be made readily available to the employee upon reasonable request.
6. When a piece rate or incentive plan is in operation, piece rates or an explanation of the incentive plan formula shall be provided to employees. An accurate production record shall be maintained by the employer.

60. Labor Code § 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

61. On information and belief, Defendants have willfully failed to maintain the records required by § 1174 and Wage Order, including, but not limited to, the total premium wages earned for missed meal and rest periods, and records pertaining to all unpaid hours worked by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees

H. CIVIL PENALTIES SOUGHT

62. Labor Code § 204 states

(a) All wages, other than those mentioned in Section 201, 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. ...

(b) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, 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.

(2) An employer is in compliance with the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 226 relating to total hours worked by the employee, if hours worked in excess of the normal work period during the current pay period are itemized as corrections on the paystub for the next regular pay period. Any corrections set out in a subsequently issued paystub shall state the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employer is correcting its initial report of hours worked.

(c) However, when employees are covered by a collective bargaining agreement that provides different pay arrangements, those arrangements shall apply to the covered employees.



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 (d) The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment
2 of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not
more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

3 63. Defendants paid wages to employees on regular intervals. Defendants failed to pay
4 Plaintiff on such intervals for all wages earned and all hours worked. On information and belief,
5 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants also failed to pay the Aggrieved Employees on such intervals for
6 all wages earned and all hours worked.

7 64. During the applicable time period, Defendants violated California Labor Code
8 §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

9 65. California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on
10 behalf of themselves and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil
11 penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code § 2699.3.

12 66. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
13 Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for each of the Defendants' violations of
14 California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, and
2802 during the applicable limitations period in the following amounts:

15 A. For violations of California Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars
16 (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars
17 (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation
18 (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 210).

19 B. For violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), two hundred fifty dollars
20 (\$250.00) per employee for initial violation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) per employee
21 for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 226.3).

22 C. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars
23 (\$50.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation for pay period for which the
24 employee was underpaid and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each underpaid employee for
25 each pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalty amounts established by
California Labor Code § 558).

26 D. For violations of California Labor Code § 1174, five hundred dollars
27 (\$500.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation (penalty amounts established
28 by Labor Code § 1174.5).



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

1 E. For violations of California Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars
2 (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial and intentional violation and two hundred
3 fifty dollars (\$250.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period
4 (regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed) (penalty amounts
5 established by California Labor Code § 1197.1).

6 F. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1194,
7 1198, and 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
8 each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay
9 period for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code
§ 2699(f)(2)).

10 **H. NOTICE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND DEFENDANTS**

11 67. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California
12 Labor Code § 2699.3. By letter dated June 11, 2021, Plaintiff gave written notice by certified mail
13 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants of the specific
14 provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and
15 theories to support the alleged violations. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s letter to the LWDA
16 dated June 11, 2021 is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The LWDA has not responded to Plaintiff’s
letter.

17 68. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
18 Employees are entitled to an award of civil penalties, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs in
19 connection with their claims for civil penalties.

20 **VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 69. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Aggrieved Employees, prays
22 for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 23 A. Civil penalties;
24 B. Costs of suit;
25 C. Reasonable attorneys’ fees; and
26 D. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

27 ///

28 ///

///



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

VII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all other Aggrieved Employees, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

Dated: August 17, 2021

By



DAVID SPIVAK

MAYA CHEAITANI, Attorneys for Plaintiff,
AKANKSHA MASSEY, and all others
similarly situated



SPIVAK LAW

Employee Rights Attorneys
16530 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 203
Encino, CA 91436
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

EXHIBIT A



SPIVAK LAW

SENT BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION, CERTIFIED MAIL, AND EMAIL

June 11, 2021

Attn: PAGA Administrator
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
<http://dir.tflaforms.net>
Via Electronic Submission

Re: *Akanksha Massey / Children of the Night*

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, Akanksha Massey (hereafter “Massey”) provides notice on behalf of herself and on behalf of all individuals currently and formerly employed in California as non-exempt, hourly employees, including but not limited to tutors, teachers, educators, and persons in similar positions (hereafter “Aggrieved Employees”), by Children of the Night, Inc. (hereafter “COTN”), of alleged violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198 and 2802.

At all relevant times, COTN has employed persons, conducted business, and engaged in illegal payroll practices and policies, throughout California. Massey and the Aggrieved Employees are “employees” within the meaning of Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 5-2001 (hereafter “the Wage Order”) section 2, subdivision (F) and “Aggrieved Employees” within the meaning of Labor Code section 2699(c).

///

///

Statement of Facts

On approximately October 5, 2020, COTN employed Massey at its headquarters located at 3450 Cahuenga Blvd W, Los Angeles, California as a global tutor. COTN continuously employed her in that capacity until on or about November 17, 2020.

At all relevant times, COTN issued wages to Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees on a bi-weekly basis and paid them at an hourly rate of pay. At all relevant times, COTN classified Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of both the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

COTN failed to compensate Massey and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including overtime. Massey and the Aggrieved Employees often worked five (5) to six (6) days in a workweek, and between four (4) and nine (9) hours per workday. At all relevant times, Massey and the Aggrieved Employees worked over eight (8) hours in one workday and over forty (40) hours in one workweek. COTN, however, failed to pay Massey and the Aggrieved Employees overtime wages of at least one and a half 1½ times their hourly rates of pay for all hours in excess of forty (40) in a week, and all hours in excess of eight (8) in a day. COTN intentionally failed to pay Massey and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours. COTN advised Massey that she had “not been approved for any of the above forementioned overtime.” However, COTN frequently forced Massey and the Aggrieved Employees to work overtime hours by assigning them more time-sensitive work than it could reasonably expect them to complete within their assigned shifts.

At all relevant times, COTN failed to provide Massey and the Aggrieved Employees with all timely meal periods. Due to the workload COTN denied Massey and the Aggrieved Employees their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. COTN also denied meal periods to Massey and the Aggrieved Employees because COTN frequently required Massey and the Aggrieved Employees to teach back-to-back classes without periods of rest between them.

Moreover, COTN failed to authorize and permit Massey and the Aggrieved Employees with rest periods in violation of California law. Due to high workload and low staffing levels, COTN failed to authorize and permit Massey and the Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. COTN did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. Furthermore, COTN failed to pay premium wages for days on which it failed to provide Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods. COTN also failed to pay premium wages for days on which it failed to provide Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees with timely rest periods.

At all relevant times, COTN required Massey and the Aggrieved Employees to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. COTN required Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees to use their personal mobile phones to communicate with students and co-workers and to coordinate their schedules with supervisors. COTN did not offer mobile phones to Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees for this purpose, nor did it reimburse them for use of their personal mobile phones.

COTN failed to issue to Massey and the Aggrieved Employees complete and accurate wage statements as a result of its failure to state all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, and all wages earned including rest period and meal period premium wages. COTN also failed to timely pay Massey and the Aggrieved Employees all earned wages described above during and at the conclusion of employment. Moreover, COTN failed to maintain accurate employee records of Massey and the Aggrieved Employees.

For the reasons stated herein, Massey alleges the following violations of the California Labor Code and the Wage Order on behalf of herself and the other Aggrieved Employees:

- (a) COTN failed to pay Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay;

///

- (b) COTN failed to provide Massey and the Aggrieved Employees all meal periods and rest periods in compliance with California law;
- (c) COTN failed to compensate Massey and the Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which COTN failed to provide them with their rest breaks as required by law;
- (d) COTN failed to compensate Massey and the Aggrieved at one hour's pay for each day in which it failed to provide them with their meal periods as required by law;
- (e) COTN failed to indemnify Massey and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business expenditures incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- (f) COTN failed to provide Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees with accurate wage statements; and
- (g) COTN failed to timely pay Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees all earned and unpaid wages during their employment with COTN.

Accordingly, Massey now seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself and the other Aggrieved Employees based on COTN's alleged violations of the California Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The Wage Order

The Wage Order applies to "all persons employed in professional, technical, clerical, mechanical, and similar occupations whether paid on a time, piece rates, commission, or other basis[.]" § 1. "Professional, Technical, Clerical, Mechanical, and Similar Occupations" includes "Professional, Technical, Clerical, Mechanical, and Similar Occupations" includes "professional, semiprofessional, managerial, supervisorial, laboratory, research, technical, clerical, office work, and mechanical occupations". § 2(O). Said occupations include teachers. *Id.* At

all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, COTN employed Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees as teachers. Accordingly, Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to the protections provided under the Wage Order.

Failure To Pay Wages For All Hours Worked At The Correct
Rates of Pay
(Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198)

Under Labor Code section 1197, “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.”

In relevant part, section 2(K) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so[.]

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1194 states:

(a) Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees, and costs of suit.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 510 states:

Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be

compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.

In relevant part, Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

The following overtime provisions are applicable to employees 18 years of age or over and to employees 16 or 17 years of age who are not required by law to attend school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from engaging in the subject work. Such employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or more than 40 in a workweek unless the employee receives one and one half (1½) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek. Eight (8) hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Employment beyond eight (8) hours in any workday or more than six (6) days in any workweek is permissible provided the employee is compensated for such overtime at not less than:

- (a) One and one-half (1½) times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including twelve (12) hours in any workday, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek.

Labor Code § 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

In conjunction, these provisions of the Labor Code require employers to pay employees no less than their agreed-upon or statutorily mandated wage rates for all hours worked, including hours spent working "off-the-clock" (before punching in or after punching out on a time clock) when the employer knew or reasonably should have known that employees were working during those hours. *Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 575, 585.

///

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, COTN failed to compensate Massey and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including, but not limited to overtime wages for all overtime hours they worked at the correct rates of pay.

Accordingly, Massey now seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself and the Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$50 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code § 510, and \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages (penalties set by California Labor Code § 558);
2. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code § 1194, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)); and
3. \$100 for each underpaid hourly employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code § 1197, and \$250 for each underpaid employee for each subsequent violation per pay period (regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed), in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203 (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1).
4. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code § 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));

///

Failure to Provide Meal Periods
(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198)

In relevant part, section 2(K) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1198 states, “The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage Order] is unlawful.”

In relevant part, Labor Code section 512 states:

An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

In relevant part, section 11 of the Wage Order states:

Meal Periods:

- (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less

than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. . . .

- (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.

In addition, Labor Code section 226.7 states:

- (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.
- (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.

At all relevant times, COTN failed to provide Massey and the Aggrieved Employees with all timely rest and meal periods. Due to the workload and failure

to hire sufficient staff members, COTN denied Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. . COTN also denied meal periods to Massey and the Aggrieved Employees because COTN frequently required Massey and the Aggrieved Employees to teach back to back classes without intervals. Furthermore, COTN failed to pay premium wages for days on which it failed to provide Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods.

Accordingly, Massey now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that COTN has committed against her and the Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 226.7, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code section 2699(f)(2));
2. \$50 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 512, and \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages (penalties set by California Labor Code section 558); and
3. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods
(Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 1198)

Section 2(K) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the

employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1198 states,

The employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage Order] is unlawful.

Section 12 of the Wage Order provides, in relevant part:

Rest Periods:

- (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized 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. However, a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages.
- (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

In addition, Labor Code section 226.7 states:

- (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the

Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

- (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.

Due to high workload and low staffing levels, COTN failed to authorize and permit Massey and the Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. COTN did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Divisions of Labor Standards Enforcement. Moreover, COTN failed to pay Massey and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages on workdays it failed to provide them with 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof.

Accordingly, Massey now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that COTN has committed against her and the Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 226.7, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)); and
2. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

///

Failure to Reimburse for Expenses
(Lab. Code § 2802 and 1198)

In pertinent part, California Labor Code § 2802(a) states, “An employer shall indemnify his or her employee[s] for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

Labor Code Section 1198 prohibits an employer from employing any person under conditions that violate the Wage Order.

As described above, COTN required Massey and the Aggrieved Employees to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. During the applicable limitations period, COTN required Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees to use their personal mobile phones to communicate with students and co-workers and to coordinate their schedules with supervisors. COTN did not offer mobile phones to Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees for this purpose, nor did it reimburse them for use of their personal mobile phones. Accordingly, Massey seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that COTN has committed against her and the Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 2802, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)); and
2. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

///

///

Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements
(Lab. Code § 226)

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to provide an employee, either semi-monthly or at the time of each wage payment, with an accurate and itemized written wage statement that shows:

1. Gross wages earned;
2. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
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 Employer 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, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized statement;
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.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, COTN violated California Labor Code section 226 because it did not properly and accurately itemize each employee's gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked, the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee and other requirements of California Labor Code section 226. COTN failed to state in the wage statements it issued to Massey and the other Aggrieved Employees all their hours worked and wages earned, including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock after clocking-out (as described above).

Accordingly, Massey seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that COTN has committed against her and the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$250 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), and \$1,000 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation (penalties set by California Labor Code section 226.3).

Failure to Timely Pay Wages
(Lab. Code § 204)

California Labor Code section 204 states all wages (other than those mentioned in Labor Code sections 201 and 202) earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. In addition, all wages for work performed in excess of the normal work period must be paid by no later than the following regular payday.

COTN failed to compensate Massey and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including overtime. COTN failed to provide Massey and the Aggrieved Employees with all meal and rest periods in compliance with California laws. COTN also failed to provide Massey and the Aggrieved Employees with all premium wages on workdays it failed to provide

them with one or more meal or rest periods in compliance with California laws. As a result, COTN failed to timely pay all earned minimum, overtime, and premium wages due during employment within the time periods set by California Labor Code section 204.

Accordingly, Massey now seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that COTN has committed against her and the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 204, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each Aggrieved Employee (penalties set by Labor Code section 210).

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination of Employment
(Lab. Code §§ 201-203)

Under Labor Code § 2019, if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. Under § 202, if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous 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. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. *Id.* The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting. *Id.*

Under Labor Code § 203, if an employer willfully fails to pay without abatement or reduction, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, the wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, 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 therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

COTN failed to pay Massey and the Aggrieved Employees whose employment ended all of the earned but unpaid wages described above by the conclusion of their employment with Massey. By failing to pay Massey and the Aggrieved Employees as set forth above by such time, COTN is liable for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203. Accordingly, on behalf of herself and the Aggrieved Employees, Massey seeks civil penalties from COTN as follows:

1. For violations of Labor Code § 201, \$100 per Aggrieved Employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 201 occurred, and \$200 per Aggrieved Employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 201 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
2. For violations of Labor Code § 202, \$100 per Aggrieved Employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 202 occurred, and \$200 per Aggrieved Employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 202 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)); and
3. For violations of Labor Code § 203, \$100 per Aggrieved Employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 203 occurred, and \$200 for per Aggrieved Employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 203 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records
(Lab. Code §§ 1174 & 1198)

Labor Code section 1174, which also pertains to recordkeeping, states:

Every person employing labor in this state shall:

...

- (c) Keep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors.

(d) Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned.

Labor Code section 1174.5 states:

Any person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of Section 1174 or accurate and complete records required by subdivision (d) of Section 1174, or to allow any member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

Section 7 of Wage Order states,

(A) Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following:

- (1) Full name, home address, occupation and social security number.
- (2) Birth date, if under 18 years, and designation as a minor.
- (3) Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded. Meal periods during which operations cease and authorized rest periods need not be recorded.

- (4) Total wages paid each payroll period, including value of board, lodging, or other compensation actually furnished to the Employee.
- (5) Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay. This information shall be made readily available to the employee upon reasonable request.
- (6) When a piece rate or incentive plan is in operation, piece rates or an explanation of the incentive plan formula shall be provided to employees. An accurate production record shall be maintained by the employer.

Labor Code section 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

COTN failed to compensate Massey and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including overtime. COTN failed to provide Massey and the Aggrieved Employees with all meal and rest periods in compliance with California laws. COTN also failed to provide Massey and the Aggrieved Employees with premium wages on workdays it failed to provide them with one or more meal or rest periods in compliance with California laws. As a result, COTN has failed to accurately maintain all records required by section 1174 and the Wage Order, including but not limited to Massey and the Aggrieved Employees' total hours worked, total wages paid, and applicable hourly rates during each payroll period.

Accordingly, Massey seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself and the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$500 for each Aggrieved Employee for each violation of California Labor Code section 1174 (penalties set by Labor Code section 1174.5); and

///

2. \$100 for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation of California Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by California Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

Conclusion

As noted above, this letter constitutes the required notice under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004. Please be advised that I will seek both reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) in a civil action should the LWDA decline to pursue this matter. This letter also serves as a formal notice under the catalyst theory and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 to resolve this matter before litigation.

Sincerely,



David Spivak, Esq.

Michelle Grimberg, Esq.

David@spivaklaw.com

Michelle@spivaklaw.com

cc: Akanksha Massey

///

///

///

///

///

///

Children of the Night
c/o Steven C. Amundson, Esq.
Manning & Kass, Ellrod, Ramirez, Trester LLP
801 S. Figueroa St, 15th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
sca@manningllp.com

Children of the Night
c/o Alina Sookasian, Esq.
Manning & Kass, Ellrod, Ramirez, Trester LLP
801 S. Figueroa St, 15th Floor, 801 Tower
Los Angeles, California 90017
aws@manningllp.com