

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

2 Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

3 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

4 Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

5 Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

6 2255 Calle Clara

7 La Jolla, CA 92037

8 Telephone: (858)551-1223

9 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

10 Website: www.bamlawca.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff

ELECTRONICALLY

FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

10/08/2021

Clerk of the Court

BY: RONNIE OTERO

Deputy Clerk

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

9 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

CGC-21-595913

10 ALMA HEYMAN, on behalf of the State
11 of California, as a private attorney
12 general,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 RENOIR HM, LLC, a Limited Liability
16 Company; and Does 1 through 50,
17 Inclusive,

18 Defendants.

Case No. _____

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:

1.Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code
§ 2699, *et seq.* for violations of Labor
Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210,
221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 351, 510, 512,
558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
2802, California Code of Regulations,
Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-
(B)

1 Plaintiff Alma Heyman (“PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of the people of the State of California
2 and as an “aggrieved employee” acting as a private attorney general under the Labor Code
3 Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) only, alleges on information
4 and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the
5 following:

6 INTRODUCTION

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against Defendant Renoir HM, LLC (referred to as
8 “DEFENDANT”) seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties for himself, and on behalf of
9 all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does
10 **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code**
11 **§ 2699.** To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF
12 does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil
13 penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

14 2. California has enacted the PAGA to permit an individual to bring an action on
15 behalf of himself and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole
16 nature of this action.

17 3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for
18 DEFENDANT’s violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA – that
19 is, penalties and any other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to the PAGA. Nothing in this
20 complaint should be construed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in
21 a PAGA-only action.

22 THE PARTIES

24 4. Defendant Renoir HM, LLC is a Limited Liability Company that at all relevant
25 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business
26 throughout California.

27 5. DEFENDANT belongs to the Hotel & Hospitality industry and specializes in the
28

1 management and operations of boutique hotels.

2 6. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California as a non-exempt
3 employee entitled to overtime pay and meal and rest periods from April of 2021 to June of 2021.
4 PLAINTIFF was at all times relevant mentioned herein classified by DEFENDANT as a non-
5 exempt employee paid in whole or in part on an hourly basis and received additional
6 compensation from DEFENDANT in the form of non-discretionary incentive wages.

7 7. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
8 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
9 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to himself
10 and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and
11 who were classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time
12 period of July 9, 2020 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

13 8. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of himself and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently
14 or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative
15 action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT's
16 violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3,
17 351, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations,
18 Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon
19 the foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees
20 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

21 9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
22 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently
23 unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant
24 to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege
25 the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained.
26 PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that
27 the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
28

responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

10. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

THE CONDUCT

11. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for their minimum and overtime wages. DEFENDANT unlawfully and unilaterally failed to accurately calculate minimum and overtime wages for time worked by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in order to avoid paying these employees the correct compensation. Specifically, during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to wait in line and submit to mandatory temperature checks for COVID-19 screening and also complete a COVID-19 questionnaire regarding whether these employees had any symptoms prior to clocking into DEFENDANT's timekeeping system for the workday. This additional time worked was work performed subject to DEFENDANT's control and for DEFENDANT's benefit. Consequently, all this time constitutes "hours worked" and is therefore compensable. DEFENDANT's policy and practice to not pay employees for compensable work time is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due them for working without compensation at the correct minimum wage and overtime rates.

1 DEFENDANT's policy and practice to not pay the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES the correct
2 compensation for all time worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by
3 DEFENDANT's business records. This policy and practice of DEFENDANT was intended to
4 purposefully avoid the payment of the correct compensation as required by California law which
5 allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who
6 complied with the law.

7 12. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay
8 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these
9 employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
10 DEFENDANT is required to pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all
11 time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an
12 employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work.
13 DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the
14 time they were under DEFENDANT's control, including, but not limited to, time spent
15 undergoing mandatory drug testing or any other testing and/or examination required as a
16 condition of employment. Specifically, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while
17 clocked out during what was supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF
18 was from time to time interrupted by work assignments. Also, DEFENDANT, as a matter of
19 established company policy and procedure, administered a uniform practice of rounding the
20 actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES,
21 always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment,
22 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid less than they would have been
23 paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result,
24 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited minimum wage and overtime
25 compensation by working without their time being accurately recorded and without
26 compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. To the extent that the time
27 worked off the clock did not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT failed to pay
28

1 minimum wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197,
2 and 1197.1. Further, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from time to time
3 were not paid wages for all time worked, including overtime wages, such that in the aggregate
4 employees were underpaid wages as a result of DEFENDANT's pattern and practice of unevenly
5 rounding time worked by its employees.

6 13. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and rest break
7 premiums at one-and-one-half times their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and other
8 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was
9 tied to specific elements of an employee’s performance.

10 14. The second component of PLAINTIFF’s and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’
11 compensation was DEFENDANT’s non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF
12 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incentive wages based on their performance for
13 DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all employees paid on an
14 hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the various performance
15 goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate of pay in order to pay
16 overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
17 EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the
18 employees’ “regular rate of pay” for purposes of calculating overtime and meal and rest break
19 premium pay. Management and supervisors described the incentive program to potential and
20 new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive
21 compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be included
22 in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted in an underpayment of overtime
23 compensation and meal and rest break premiums pay to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
24 EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANT.

25 15. DEFENDANT also underpaid meal and rest break penalties and sick pay wages
26 to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the
27 regular rate of pay. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt employees regularly earn
28

1 non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, incentives, shift differential pay,
2 and bonuses. Rather than pay meal and rest break penalties and sick pay at the regular rate of
3 pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
4 at their base rates of pay. The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of
5 compensation to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANT.

6 16. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
7 EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in violation of Cal. Lab.
8 Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt employees regularly earn
9 non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, incentives, shift differential pay,
10 and bonuses. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick
11 pay to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of pay.

12 17. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(l)(2) requires that paid sick time for non-exempt
13 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime
14 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days
15 of employment.

16 18. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay at
17 the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES routinely earned non-
18 discretionary incentive wages, including but not limited to, incentives, shift differential pay, and
19 bonuses, which increased their regular rate of pay. However, when sick pay was paid, it was paid
20 at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, as opposed
21 to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as required under Cal. Lab. Code Section 246.

22 19. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF and
23 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time
24 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is informed and believes
25 and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful, such that
26 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose employment has separated are
27 entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

1 20. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
2 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT
3 intentionally and knowingly failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED
4 EMPLOYEES at the correct rate of pay for all overtime worked. This policy and practice of
5 DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment of the correct overtime
6 compensation as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and
7 gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable
8 tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against DEFENDANT, the
9 PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

10 21. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
11 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take off duty meal breaks and
12 were not fully relieved of duty for meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
13 EMPLOYEES were from time to time required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
14 for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further,
15 DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a
16 second off-duty meal period from time to time in which these employees were required by
17 DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED
18 EMPLOYEES therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in
19 accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

20 22. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
21 were from time to time also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided
22 ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at
23 least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and
24 second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and
25 eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some
26 shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and other
27 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As
28

1 a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
2 were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's
3 managers. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to provide
4 employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time
5 during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer
6 control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers
7 authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve
8 employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which
9 includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers
10 cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out,
11 five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other
12 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and was unlawful based on
13 Defendant's rule which stated PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES could not
14 leave the work premises during their rest period.

15 23. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her
16 employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things,
17 gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
18 corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT from time to time
19 failed to provide to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wage statements that
20 identify the correct gross and net wages earned, the applicable number of hours worked and
21 rates of pay. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis.
22 As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and
23 the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant
24 to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to
25 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More
26 specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay
27 period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). When the hours shown on the wage
28

1 statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay
2 period. Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue
3 to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an itemized wage statement that lists
4 all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.*

5 24. Cal. Lab. Code § 204 provides that “[a]ll wages. . . earned by any person in any
6 employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in
7 advance by the employer as the regular paydays.” Further, Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) expressly
8 requires employers to pay employees all wages owed within seven (7) days of the close of the
9 payroll period. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other
10 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages owed to them within seven (7) days of the close of the
11 payroll period.

12 25. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, “It shall be unlawful for any employer
13 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to
14 said employee.” DEFENDANT made unlawful deductions from compensation payable to
15 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, failed to disclose all aspects of the
16 deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES,
17 and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable pay period and upon
18 termination.

19 26. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
20 PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses
21 incurred by the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of
22 discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section
23 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course
24 and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall
25 indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee
26 in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the
27 directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying
28

1 the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

2 27. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
3 EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal
4 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
5 DEFENDANT but were not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost
6 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. As a
7 result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and other
8 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but
9 were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and
10 for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

11 28. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED
12 EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT engaged in a company-wide policy and procedure which failed
13 to accurately calculate and record the correct overtime rate for the overtime worked by
14 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. The proper calculation of these
15 employees' overtime hour rates is the DEFENDANT's burden. As a result of DEFENDANT's
16 intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT failed to properly
17 calculate and/or pay all required overtime compensation for work performed by the
18 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and violated the California Labor Code and regulations
19 promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

20 29. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA
21 PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect
22 PLAINTIFF during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF seeks penalties for those violations that
23 affected other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.* 2018
24 AJDAR 12157 (Certified for Publication 12/19/18).

25 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

26 30. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
27 Procedure, Section 410.10.
28

1 31. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
2 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times
3 maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this
4 County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against
5 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

6
7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act**

9 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*]**

10 **(By PLAINTIFF and Against All Defendants)**

11 32. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set
12 forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

13 33. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
14 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of
15 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under
16 PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to
17 benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution,
18 but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the
19 Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the
20 public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover
21 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA
22 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

23 34. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
24 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
25 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
26 with respect to himself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by
27 DEFENDANT in California and who were classified as non-exempt employees
28 ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of July 9, 2020 until a date as

1 determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

2 35. On July 9, 2021, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the
3 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
4 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
5 Labor Code § 2699.3. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations
6 to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may
7 now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the
8 proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein
9 defined.

10 36. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
11 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
12 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to
13 properly record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay
14 minimum wages, (d) failed to pay overtime and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse
15 employees for required expenses, and (f) failed to provide wages when due, all in violation
16 of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*,
17 210, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 351, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802,
18 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the
19 applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such
20 conduct.¹ PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the
21 Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of
22 California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED
23 EMPLOYEES.

24 ///

25 ///

26
27 ¹Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor
28 Code §558(a)(3).

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and
3 severally, as follows:

4 1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
5 EMPLOYEES:

6 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private
7 Attorneys General Act of 2004; and,

8 B) An award of attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the
9 law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

10 Dated: October 8, 2021 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW
11 LLP

12
13 By: /s/ Norman Blumenthal
14 Norman B. Blumenthal
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28