

1 DAVID G. SPIVAK (SBN 179684)
david@spivaklaw.com

2 MAYA CHEAITANI (SBN 335777)
maya@spivaklaw.com

3 SARA BROWN (SBN 325763)
sara@spivaklaw.com

4 THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM
5 16530 Ventura Blvd., Suite 203
Encino, CA 91436

6 Telephone: (213) 725-9094

7 Facsimile: (213) 634-2485

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
9 RANI YACOUB, and all others similarly situated

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

11 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**
12 **(UNLIMITED JURISDICTION)**

13 RANI YACOUB, on behalf of himself and all
14 others similarly situated, and as an “aggrieved
employee” on behalf of other “aggrieved
15 employees” under the Labor Code Private
Attorneys General Act of 2004,

16 *Plaintiff,*

17 vs.

18
19 TEPPER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. d/b/a
20 INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGLISH,
a California corporation; and DOES 1–50,
21 inclusive,

22 *Defendants.*

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

11/16/2021 at 04:44:05 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Taylor Crandall, Deputy Clerk

Case No. 37-2021-00048650-CU-OE-CTL

CLASS ACTION

COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Failure to Pay All Wages Earned for All Hours Worked and Other Compensable Hours at the Correct Rates of Pay (Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 1198);
4. Failure to Indemnify (Lab. Code §§ 1198 and 2802);
5. Wage Statement Penalties (Lab. Code § 226);
6. Waiting Time Penalties (Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
7. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; and
8. Civil Penalties (Lab Code §§ 2698, et seq.).

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED



1 Plaintiff, Rani Yacoub (hereafter “Plaintiff” or “Yacoub”), on behalf of himself and all
2 others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **I. INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action for alleged violations of the
5 California Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4-2001 (hereafter “the Wage
6 Order”), and the California Business and Professions Code against Defendants Tepper
7 Technologies, Inc. d/b/a International Academy of English, a California corporation, and Does 1
8 through 50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”).

9 2. As set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants are liable to
10 him and other similarly situated workers for unpaid wages, penalties, interest, and related relief.
11 These claims are based on Defendants’ failures to:

12 (A) Pay all wages, including minimum, regular, overtime and doubletime
13 wages, earned for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay;

14 (B) Provide all meal periods;

15 (C) Authorize and permit all rest breaks;

16 (D) Pay premium wages for unprovided meal periods;

17 (E) Pay premium wages for unprovided rest breaks;

18 (F) Indemnify for necessary work-related expenditures;

19 (G) Issue only accurate and complete itemized wage statements;

20 (H) Timely pay wages during and upon termination of employment;

21 Accordingly, Plaintiff now seeks to recover unpaid wages, interest, restitution, statutory penalties,
22 attorneys’ fees, costs, and related relief through this class action.

23 **II. THE PARTIES**

24 3. Plaintiff Rani Yacoub is a resident of California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff
25 was an “employee” within the meaning of Title 8 California Code of Regulations Section 11160
26 and an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor Code Section 2699(c).

27 4. Defendant Tepper Technologies, Inc. d/b/a International Academy of English is
28 organized and existing under the laws of California and also a citizen of California based on
Plaintiff’s information and belief.

5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extents of



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

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

11 7. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,
12 Defendants, and each of them, acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy, practice, or a lack
13 of a practice which resulted in Defendants not compensating Plaintiff and the other Class
14 Members or otherwise complying with their rights in accordance with applicable California labor
15 laws as alleged herein.

16 8. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,
17 Defendants and each of them acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy and/or practice, or
18 lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants not paying Plaintiff and other members of the below-
19 described class in accordance with applicable laws as alleged herein.

20 **III. CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

21 9. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to
22 California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of
23 interest among the persons who comprise the readily ascertainable class defined below and
24 because Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in managing this case as
25 a class action.

26 10. **Class Definition:** The Class is defined as follows: All persons Defendants
27 employed in California as hourly, nonexempt teachers, academic assistants, individuals
28 performing work comparable to the aforementioned, compensated comparably to the
aforementioned, and individuals in similar positions, at any time during the period beginning four
years prior to the filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
action (“Class” or “Class Members”).



1 11. **Reservation of Rights:** Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the
2 right to amend or modify the class definition with greater specificity, by further division into
3 subclasses and/or by limitation to particular issues.

4 12. **Numerosity:** The Class Members are so numerous that the individual joinder of
5 each individual Class Member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact
6 number of Class Members, Plaintiff is informed and believes that the actual number exceeds the
7 minimum required for numerosity under California laws.

8 13. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to
9 all Class Members and predominate over any questions which affect only individual Class
10 Members. These questions include, but are not limited to:

11 A. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Class Members for
12 all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum, regular, overtime, meal period
13 premium, and rest period premium wages;

14 B. Whether Defendants failed to provide the Class Members with all meal
15 periods in compliance with California law;

16 C. Whether Defendants failed to authorize and permit the Class Members to
17 take all rest periods in compliance with California law;

18 D. Whether Defendants failed to indemnify the Class Members for the
19 reasonable expenses they incurred during the course of performing their duties;

20 E. Whether Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide the
21 class with accurate and complete itemized wage statements;

22 F. Whether Defendants willfully failed to provide the class with timely final
23 wages;

24 G. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair competition within the meaning of
25 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq., with respect to the Class; and

26 H. Whether Class Members are entitled to restitution of money or property
27 that Defendants may have acquired from them through alleged Labor Code violations.

28 14. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other Class Members' claims.
Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants have a policy and/or
practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants failing to comply with the California Labor
Code, the Wage Order, and the Business and Professions Code.



1 15. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative
2 in that he has no interests that are adverse to, or otherwise in conflict with, the interests of absent
3 Class Members. Plaintiff is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of Class
4 Members. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of Class
5 Members.

6 16. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that
7 they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent Class Members, are experienced
8 in class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of
9 Plaintiff and absent Class Members.

10 17. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and
11 efficient adjudication of Class Members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the
12 Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to simultaneously
13 and efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the unnecessary
14 duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the
15 monetary amounts due to many individual Class Members are likely to be relatively small and
16 would thus make it difficult, if not impossible, for individual Class Members to both seek and
17 obtain relief. Moreover, a class action will serve an important public interest by permitting Class
18 Members to effectively pursue the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will
19 prevent the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

20 **IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

21 18. The Wage Order applies to "all persons employed in professional, technical,
22 mechanical, and similar occupations whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other
23 basis..." Wage Order, § 1. The Wage Order defines "Professional, Technical, Clerical,
24 Mechanical, and Similar Occupations" to include:

25 professional, semiprofessional, managerial, supervisory, laboratory, research,
26 technical, clerical, office work, and mechanical occupations. Said occupations
27 shall include, but not be limited to, the following: accountants; agents; appraisers;
28 artists; attendants; audio-visual technicians; bookkeepers; bundlers; billposters;
canvassers; carriers; cashiers; checkers; clerks; collectors; communications and
sound technicians; compilers; copy holders; copy readers; copy writers; computer
programmers and operators; demonstrators and display representatives;
dispatchers; distributors; door-keepers; drafters; elevator operators; estimators;
editors; graphic arts technicians; guards; guides; hosts; inspectors; installers;
instructors; interviewers; investigators; librarians; laboratory workers; machine



1 operators; mechanics; mailers; messengers; medical and dental technicians and
2 technologists; models; nurses; packagers; photographers; porters and cleaners;
3 process servers; printers; proof readers; salespersons and sales agents; secretaries;
4 sign erectors; sign painters; social workers; solicitors; statisticians; stenographers;
5 teachers; telephone, radiotelephone, telegraph and call-out operators; tellers;
6 ticket agents; tracers; typists; vehicle operators; x-ray technicians; their assistants
7 and other related occupations listed as professional, semiprofessional, technical,
8 clerical, mechanical, and kindred occupations

9 Wage Order, § 2(O). At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the
10 Defendants, Plaintiff, and all of the Class Members were covered by the Wage Order because
11 Plaintiff and all of the Class Members worked for the Defendants as teachers, their assistants and
12 other related occupations listed as professional, semiprofessional, technical, clerical, mechanical,
13 and kindred occupations. Accordingly, Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members are entitled
14 to the protections the Wage Order provides.

15 19. On approximately February 8, 2021, the Defendants began to employ Plaintiff in
16 San Diego in the position of academic assistant. The Defendants continuously employed him in
17 that capacity until on or about August 6, 2021 when his employment ended.

18 20. At all relevant times, the Defendants issued wages to Plaintiff and all of the other
19 Class Members on a semimonthly (24 paychecks/year) basis and paid them by the hour. At all
20 relevant times, the Defendants classified Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members as non-
21 exempt employees entitled to the protections of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

22 21. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and all of the
23 other Class Members for all hours worked at the applicable minimum or regular rates of pay.
24 Defendants required Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members to work through their off-the-
25 clock meal periods without pay for the time.

26 22. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and all of the
27 other Class Members at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over eight in a day, over 40
28 in a week, and for the first eight hours of the seventh day of the workweek. The above described
unpaid work activities caused Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members to work in excess of
eight hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. However, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the
other Class Members at overtime rates of 1 and 1/2 times their regular rate of pay, or, in Plaintiff's
case, approximately \$27.00 per hour, for such off- the-clock activities.

23. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and all of the other



1 Class Members with all timely 30-minute, off-duty meal periods. As stated above, Defendants
2 required Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members to work through their off-the-clock meal
3 periods without pay for the time. The Defendants also failed to pay premium wages for days on
4 which it failed to provide Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members with meal periods as
5 required by law.

6 24. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and
7 all of the other Class Members to take ten-minute, off-duty, paid rest breaks every four hours
8 worked or major portion thereof. Defendants did not authorize or permit Yacoub and all of the
9 other Class Members to take rest periods. The Defendants also failed to pay premium wages for
10 days on which it failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members to
11 take rest breaks as required by law.

12 25. At all relevant times, the Defendants required Plaintiff and all of the other Class
13 Members to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. The
14 Defendants required Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members to supply mobile phones, and
15 computers or laptops to perform their job duties. However, the Defendants did not provide these
16 items and did not reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members for these items.

17 26. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to issue to Plaintiff and all of the other
18 Class Members complete and accurate wage statements that state all hours worked at the correct
19 rates of pay, and all wages earned. The Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to state on
20 the wage statements they issued to Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members the unpaid wages
21 discussed above. The wage statements fail to state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages
22 earned, all overtime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium
23 wages earned, all hourly rates, all hours work at each rate of pay, and related information.

24 27. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to maintain accurate employee records
25 of Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members.

26 28. For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff alleges that as a result of Defendants'
27 unlawful practices and policies, Plaintiff and the Class Members were:

- 28 A. Not provided with all off duty meal periods;
- B. Not authorized and permitted to take all rest break periods;
- C. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
authorize and permit them to take one or more timely rest periods;



1 D. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
2 provide them with one or more timely meal periods;

3 E. Not paid all wages earned, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular,
4 and overtime wages for work performed while clocked out;

5 F. Not indemnified for all necessary business expenditures incurred during
6 the discharge of their duties;

7 G. Not provided with accurate and complete wage statements; and

8 H. Not timely paid all earned and unpaid wages at the time their employment
9 ended.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES FOR ALL HOURS WORKED AT THE CORRECT
12 RATES OF PAY**

13 **Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198**

14 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

15 29. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

16 30. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Class Members have been non-exempt
17 employees entitled to the protections of both the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

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

21 32. Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

22 (A) Daily Overtime - General Provisions

23 (1) The following overtime provisions are applicable to
24 employees 18 years of age or over and to employees 16 or
25 17 years of age who are not required by law to attend
26 school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from
27 engaging in the subject work. Such employees shall not be
28 employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or
more than 40 hours in any workweek unless the employee
receives one and one-half (1 ½) 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 (1 ½) times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including 12 hours in any workday, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek.
- (b) Double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 12 hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek.
- (c) The overtime rate of compensation required to be paid to a nonexempt full-time salaried employee shall be computed by using the employee's regular hourly salary as one-fortieth (1/40) of the employee's weekly salary.

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

34. Labor Code section 510 states:

Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. 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. 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



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 Class Members for all hours worked, including, but not limited to
11 minimum, regular, overtime and doubletime wages for all minimum, regular, overtime and
12 doubletime hours, respectively, that they worked at the correct rates of pay.

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

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

19 **Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512**

20 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

21 41. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

22 42. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the
23 Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
24 of California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 1198, and the Wage Order.

25 43. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

26 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor
27 fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and
28 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.

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



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

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

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

14 **Meal Periods**

15 (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more
16 than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30
17 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6)
18 hours will complete the day's work the meal period may be waived
19 by mutual consent of the employer and the employee. Unless the
20 employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period,
21 the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and
22 counted as time worked. . . .

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

28 46. 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.

47. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512 and the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Class Members 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.

48. Defendants intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class Members with all required 30-minute duty free meal periods in accordance with the Wage Order. As stated above, Defendants required Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members to work through their off-the-clock meal periods without pay for the time.

49. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class Members with all timely rest and meal periods. Defendants denied Plaintiff and the other Class Members their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with timely meal periods.

50. 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 Class Members with all off-duty meal periods required by California law.

51. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members have suffered damages in amounts subject to proof to the extent they were not paid additional wages owed for all meal periods not provided to them.

52. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to premium wages for workdays in which one or more meal periods were not provided to them pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7.

///

///



THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST BREAKS

Lab. Code § 226.7

(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)

53. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

54. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 1198, and the Wage Order.

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

The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor 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.

56. 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 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.

57. 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.

58. Pursuant to the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Class Members were entitled to be authorized and permitted to take net rest breaks of at least ten minutes for each four-hour period of work, or major fraction thereof.

59. Defendants intentionally failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class Members to take all 10-minute rest periods free from any work duties in accordance with the Wage Order.

60. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class Members to take all timely rest periods. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium wages to Plaintiff and the Class Members for days on which they failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the other Class Members to take timely rest periods.

61. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class Members 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. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members premium wages on workdays they failed to authorize and permit them to take 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof.

62. 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 authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and the Class Members to take all rest breaks required by California law.



1 63. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with all required rest breaks in accordance
2 with the Wage Order. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at relevant times
3 within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy
4 which resulted in Defendants not providing the Class Members with all rest breaks required by
5 California law.

6 64. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff the additional wages required by California
7 Labor Code § 226.7 for all rest breaks not provided to him. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
8 thereon alleges that, at relevant times within the applicable limitations period, Defendants have
9 maintained a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy which resulted in Defendants not providing the
10 Class Members with additional wages for all rest breaks not provided to them as required by
11 California Labor Code § 226.7.

12 65. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members have
13 suffered damages in amounts subject to proof to the extent they were not paid additional wages
14 owed for all rest breaks not provided to them.

15 66. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to premium
16 wages for workdays in which one or more rest breaks were not provided to them pursuant to
17 California Labor Code § 226.7.

18 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY**

20 **Lab. Code § 2802**

21 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

22 67. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

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

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

28 70. At all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Class Members to incur
certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties.

 71. As described above, the Defendants required Plaintiff and all of the other Class
Members to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. The



1 Defendants required Plaintiff and all of the other Class members to supply mobile phones,
2 computers, or laptops to perform their job duties. However, the Defendants did not provide these
3 items and did not reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class members for these items.

4 72. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
5 Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'
6 failure to indemnify Plaintiff and the Class Members for the reasonable expenses they incurred
7 during the course of performing their duties.

8 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **FAILURE TO ISSUE ACCURATE AND COMPLETE WAGE STATEMENTS**

10 **Lab. Code § 226**

11 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

12 73. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

13 74. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class Members were
14 entitled to receive, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized
15 statement showing:

16 A. Gross wages earned;

17 B. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
18 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under
19 subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission;

20 C. The number of piece rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the
21 employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;

22 D. All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
23 Employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;

24 E. Net wages earned;

25 F. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;

26 G. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, except
27 that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an
28 employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized
statement;

H. The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and



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

3 75. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, an employee is deemed to suffer injury
4 if the employer fails to provide a wage statement. Also, an employee is deemed to suffer injury if
5 the employer fails to provide accurate and complete information as required by California Labor
6 Code § 226(a) and the employee cannot “promptly and easily determine” from the wage statement
7 alone one or more of the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 77. As alleged herein, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
23 Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly and
24 accurately itemize each employee’s gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked,
25 the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee and other requirements
26 of California Labor Code section 226. Defendants failed to state in the wage statements they
27 issued to Plaintiff and the other Class Members all their hours worked and wages earned,
28 including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock
after clocking-out (as described above). Defendants knowingly and intentionally did not issue
either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee’s wages, or
separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, statements to Plaintiff and the Class



Members that state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, all hourly rates, all hours worked at each rate of pay, and related information.

78. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with accurate wage statements was knowing and intentional. Defendants had the ability to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with accurate wage statements but intentionally provided wage statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

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

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WILLFUL FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES

(Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, and 203)

(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)

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

81. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiffs and the Class have been non-exempt employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections of California Labor Code §§ 201–203, and the Wage Order.

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

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



1 84. The Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and all of the other Class Members whose
2 employment ended all of the earned but unpaid wages described above by the conclusion of their
3 employment with Plaintiff, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages,
4 unprovided meal period premium wages, unprovided rest break premium wages, and related
5 compensation.

6 85. By failing to pay such earned wages to Plaintiff and the Class Members,
7 Defendants failed to timely pay them all earned and unpaid wages in violation of Labor Code
8 § 201 or § 202.

9 86. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failures to timely pay Plaintiff
10 and the Class Members all of their earned and unpaid wages (described above) have been willful
11 in that, at all relevant times, Defendants have deliberately maintained policies and practices that
12 violate the requirements of the Labor Code and the Wage Order, even though at all relevant times,
13 they have had the ability to comply with those legal requirements.

14 87. Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Plaintiffs seeks waiting time penalties on behalf of
15 themselves and the Class, in amounts subject to proof not to exceed 30 days of waiting time
16 penalties for each Class Member.

17 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

19 **(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

20 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

21 88. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

22 89. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the
23 Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
24 of the Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

25 90. The unlawful conduct of Defendants alleged herein amount to and constitutes
26 unfair competition within the meaning of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
27 *seq.* Due to their unfair and unlawful business practices alleged herein, Defendants have unfairly
28 gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in California
that comply with their legal obligations to compensate employees for all earned wages.

 91. As a result of Defendants' unfair competition as alleged herein, Plaintiff and the
Class Members have suffered injuries in fact and lost money or property. Plaintiff and the Class



Members were deprived of minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, missed meal period premium wages, missed rest period premium wages, reimbursement for business expenses for mobile phones, computers, and laptops, and comparable money and property.

92. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of their unlawful and unfair business practices.

93. Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(By Plaintiff and the Class against all Defendants)

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

95. 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.



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

(d) The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment 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.

96. Defendants paid wages to employees on regular intervals. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff on such intervals for all wages earned and all hours worked. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants also failed to pay the aggrieved employees on such intervals for all wages earned and all hours worked.

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

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

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

A. For violations of California Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 210).

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

C. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for initial violation and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 558).

D. For violations of California Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial and intentional violation and two hundred

1 fifty dollars (\$250.00) for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period
2 (regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed), in addition to an
3 amount sufficient to recover unpaid wages (penalty amounts established by California Labor
4 Code § 1197.1).

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

10 100. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California
11 Labor Code § 2699.3. By letter dated August 24, 2021, Plaintiff filed written notice online with
12 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and gave written notice by certified
13 mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been
14 violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. A true and correct copy
15 of Plaintiff’s written notice to the LWDA dated August 24, 2021, is attached as **Exhibit A**.
16 Plaintiff accompanied his LWDA notice with a fee in the amount of \$75.00. The LWDA has
17 failed to take action in response within 65 calendar days of the date of Plaintiff’s notice, but
18 Plaintiff anticipates that the LWDA will provide written notice to Plaintiff informing him that it
19 does not intend to investigate these allegations.

20 101. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff and the aggrieved
21 employees are entitled to an award of civil penalties, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs in
22 connection with their claims for civil penalties.

23 **V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24 102. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class Members, prays for
25 relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

26 A. An order that the action be certified as a class action with respect to
27 Plaintiff’s claims for violations of California law;

28 B. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;

C. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;

D. Unpaid wages, including minimum, regular, overtime, double-time, split
shift, vacation, missed meal period, missed rest period, nonproductive time, rest and recovery



1 time, and reporting time wages;

2 E. Statutory penalties, including waiting time penalties;

3 F. Restitution;

4 G. Declaratory relief;

5 H. Actual damages;

6 I. Civil Penalties;

7 J. Pre-judgment interest;

8 K. Costs of suit;

9 L. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and

10 M. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

11 **VI. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

12 Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other Class Members, hereby demands a jury trial
13 on all issues so triable.

14 Respectfully submitted,

15 THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

16 Dated: November 15, 2021

17 By: 

18 DAVID G. SPIVAK,
19 MAYA CHEAITANI
20 SARA BROWN

21 Attorneys for Plaintiff, RANI YACOUB, and all
22 others similarly situated
23
24
25
26
27
28



EXHIBIT A



SPIVAK LAW

SENT BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION AND CERTIFIED MAIL

August 24, 2021

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

Re: Rani Yacoub / International Academy of English

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, Rani Yacoub (hereafter “Yacoub” or “Complainant”) provides notice that Tepper Technologies, Inc., a California corporation dba International Academy of English, and related entities (collectively “the International Academy of English Employers” or “the Employers”) violated his rights and those of all other individuals the International Academy of English Employers have employed or otherwise contracted with in California as hourly, nonexempt teachers, academic assistants, academic administrative supervisors, designated school officials, individuals performing work comparable to the aforementioned, and individuals in similar positions (hereafter the “Aggrieved Employees”) under Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802. On behalf of himself and all other Aggrieved Employees, Yacoub hereby provides this notice to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency and the International Academy of English Employers and their agents and representatives.

At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers have employed persons, conducted business, and engaged in illegal payroll practices

and policies, throughout California. Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees are “employees” within the meaning of Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4-2001 (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 February 8, 2021, the International Academy of English Employers began to employ Yacoub in San Diego in the position of academic administrative supervisor / DSO (designated school official). The International Academy of English Employers continuously employed him in that capacity until on or about August 6, 2021 when his employment ended.

At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers issued wages to Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees on a semimonthly (24 paychecks/year) basis and paid them by the hour. At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers classified Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The International Academy of English Employers failed to compensate Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the applicable minimum or regular rates of pay. The International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to work through their off-the-clock meal periods without pay.

The International Academy of English Employers failed to compensate Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over eight in a day, over 40 in a week, and for the first eight hours of the seventh day of the workweek. At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers forced Yacoub and the Aggrieved Employees to work overtime hours by increasing their workload and assigning them more time-sensitive work than it could reasonably expect them to complete within their assigned shifts. The above described unpaid work activities caused Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight hours in a day

and 40 hours in a week. However, the International Academy of English Employers did not pay Yacoub and the other Aggrieved Employees at overtime rates of 1½ times their regular rate of pay for such off the clock activities.

At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers failed to provide Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely 30-minute, off-duty meal periods. As stated above, the International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to work through their off-the-clock meal periods without pay for the time. The International Academy of English Employers also failed to pay premium wages for days on which it failed to provide Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with meal periods as required by law.

At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers failed to authorize and permit Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, off-duty, paid rest breaks every four hours worked or major portion thereof. The International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. The International Academy of English Employers also failed to pay premium wages for days on which it failed to authorize and permit Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks as required by law.

At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. The International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to supply mobile phones, and personal computers or laptops to perform their job duties. However, the International Academy of English Employers did not provide these items and did not reimburse Yacoub and the other Aggrieved Employees for these items.

At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers failed to issue to Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees complete and accurate wage statements that state all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, and all wages earned. The International Academy of English Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Yacoub and all

of the other Aggrieved Employees the unpaid wages discussed above. The wage statements fail to state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, all hourly rates, and all hours work at each rate of pay.

The International Academy of English Employers also failed to timely pay Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned wages as described above during and at the conclusion of employment.

The International Academy of English Employers failed to maintain accurate employee records of Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

For the reasons stated herein, Yacoub alleges the following violations of the Labor Code and the Wage Order on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees:

- (a) The International Academy of English Employers failed to pay Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages;
- (b) The International Academy of English Employers failed to provide Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all meal periods in compliance with California law;
- (c) The International Academy of English Employers failed to authorize and permit Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks in compliance with California law;
- (d) The International Academy of English Employers failed to compensate Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which the International Academy of English Employers failed to provide them with one or more meal periods as required by law;

- (e) The International Academy of English Employers failed to compensate Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which the International Academy of English Employers failed to authorize and permit them to take one or more rest breaks as required by law;
- (f) The International Academy of English Employers failed to indemnify Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business expenditures incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- (g) The International Academy of English Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with accurate wage statements;
- (h) The International Academy of English Employers willfully failed to timely pay Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned and unpaid wages during their employment with the International Academy of English Employers and when their employment ended; and
- (i) The International Academy of English Employers failed to maintain accurate employment records pertaining to Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

Accordingly, Yacoub now seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees based on the International Academy of English Employers' alleged violations of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The Wage Order

The Wage Order applies to "all persons employed in professional, technical, mechanical, and similar occupations whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other basis..." Wage Order, § 1. The Wage Order defines "Professional, Technical, Clerical, Mechanical, and Similar Occupations" to include

professional, semiprofessional, managerial, supervisory, laboratory, research, technical, clerical, office work, and mechanical occupations. Said occupations shall include, but not be limited to, the following: accountants; agents; appraisers; artists; attendants; audio-visual technicians; bookkeepers; bundlers; billposters; canvassers; carriers; cashiers; checkers; clerks; collectors; communications and sound technicians; compilers; copy holders; copy readers; copy writers; computer programmers and operators; demonstrators and display representatives; dispatchers; distributors; door-keepers; drafters; elevator operators; estimators; editors; graphic arts technicians; guards; guides; hosts; inspectors; installers; instructors; interviewers; investigators; librarians; laboratory workers; machine operators; mechanics; mailers; messengers; medical and dental technicians and technologists; models; nurses; packagers; photographers; porters and cleaners; process servers; printers; proof readers; salespersons and sales agents; secretaries; sign erectors; sign painters; social workers; solicitors; statisticians; stenographers; teachers; telephone, radiotelephone, telegraph and call-out operators; tellers; ticket agents; tracers; typists; vehicle operators; x-ray technicians; their assistants and other related occupations listed as professional, semiprofessional, technical, clerical, mechanical, and kindred occupations

Wage Order, § 2(O). At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the International Academy of English Employers, Yacoub, and all of the Aggrieved Employees were covered by the Wage Order because the International Academy of English Employers operated, and Yacoub, and all of the Aggrieved Employees, worked for the International Academy of English Employers as teachers, their assistants and other related occupations listed as professional, semiprofessional, technical, clerical, mechanical, and kindred occupations. Accordingly, Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to the protections the Wage Order provides.

///

///

///

///

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;
- (b) Double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 12 hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek; and
- (c) The overtime rate of compensation required to be paid to a nonexempt full-time salaried employee shall be computed by using the employee's regular hourly salary as one fortieth (1/40) of the employee's weekly salary.

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.

The International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to work through their off-the-clock meal periods without pay for the time. At all relevant times, the International Academy of English Employers forced Yacoub and the Aggrieved Employees to work overtime hours by increasing their workload and assigning them more time-sensitive work than it could reasonably expect them to complete within their assigned shifts. The above described unpaid work activities caused Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. However, the International Academy of English Employers did not pay Yacoub and the other Aggrieved Employees add overtime rates of 1 and 1/2 times their regular rate of pay for such off the clock activities.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the International Academy of English Employers failed to compensate Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including, but not limited to minimum, regular, and overtime wages for all hours they worked at the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Yacoub now seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$50 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of 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 Labor Code § 558);
2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1194, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
3. \$100 for each underpaid aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197, and \$250 for each underpaid aggrieved 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) and

4. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by 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, the International Academy of English Employers failed to provide Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely meal periods. The International Academy of English Employers denied Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. As stated above, the International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to work through their off-the-clock meal periods without pay. Furthermore, the International Academy of English Employers failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods. Accordingly, Yacoub now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the International Academy of English Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 226.7, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2));
2. \$50 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of 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 Labor Code section 558); and
3. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by 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.

The International Academy of English Employers failed to authorize and permit Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. The International Academy of English Employers did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. The International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Moreover, the International Academy of English Employers failed to pay Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees premium wages on workdays the International Academy of English Employers failed to provide Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Accordingly, Yacoub now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the International Academy of English Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

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

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

In pertinent part, 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.”

Additionally, the Wage Order states,

- (A) When uniforms are required by the employer to be worn by the employee as a condition of employment, such uniforms shall be provided and maintained by the employer.
...
- (B) When tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by the employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft.

Wage Order, § 9(B).

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

As described above, the International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. The International Academy of English Employers required Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to supply mobile phones, and personal computers or laptops to perform their job duties. However, the International Academy of English Employers did not provide these items and did not reimburse Yacoub and the other Aggrieved Employees for these items. Accordingly, Yacoub seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the International Academy of English Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 2802, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)); and
2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by 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 Employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
5. Net wages earned;
6. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
7. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, 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, the International Academy of English Employers violated Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly and accurately itemize each Aggrieved Employee's gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked, the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the Aggrieved Employee and other requirements of Labor Code section 226. The International Academy of English Employers failed to state in the wage statements they issued to Yacoub and all of 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). The International Academy of English Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees the earned but unpaid wages described above. The wage statements do not state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all meal period

premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, all hourly rates, and all hours work at each rate of pay.

Accordingly, Yacoub seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that the International Academy of English Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$250 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 226(a), and \$1,000 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 226.3).

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

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.

The International Academy of English Employers failed to compensate Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for wages earned, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, and unprovided rest break premium wages, at the intervals stated above. As a result, the International Academy of English Employers failed to timely pay all earned wages due during employment within the time periods set by Labor Code section 204. Accordingly, Yacoub now seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that the International Academy of English Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of 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.

The International Academy of English Employers failed to pay Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees whose employment ended all of the earned but unpaid wages described above by the conclusion of their employment with Yacoub, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, and unprovided rest break premium wages. By failing to pay Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as set forth above at the end of employment, the International Academy of English Employers are liable for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203. Accordingly, on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees, Yacoub seeks civil penalties from the International Academy of English Employers 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.

The International Academy of English Employers failed to compensate Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, all hourly rates, and all hours work at each rate of pay. As a result, the International Academy of English Employers have failed to accurately maintain all records required by section 1174 and the Wage Order, including but not limited to Yacoub and all of the other Aggrieved Employees' total hours worked, total wages paid, and applicable hourly rates during each payroll period. Accordingly, Yacoub seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

- 1. \$500 for each aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code section 1174 (penalties set by Labor Code section 1174.5); and
- 2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by 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 Rani Yacoub 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.
David@spivaklaw.com
cc: Rani Yacoub

Tepper Technologies, Inc. dba International Academy of English
c/o Agent for service of process
Carmen Junqueira Gomide
CEO, Tepper Technologies, Inc.
12895 HARWICK LANE
San Diego, CA 92130