

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: John Doyle

Jonathan M. Genish (CA State Bar No. 259031)
jgenish@blackstonepc.com
Jill J. Parker (CA State Bar No. 274230)
jparker@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiff Alexis Cardoza

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

ALEXIS CARDOZA, individually, and on
behalf of Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the
California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiff,

vs.

BHFC Operating LLC, a California limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 25,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. **21STCV34040**

**COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT
ACTION UNDER THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT,
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §§ 2698 ET
SEQ.**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff ALEXIS CARDOZA (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act, and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is an enforcement action under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, et seq. (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and all individuals who worked for Defendants in the State of California as hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees at any time during the period from September 15, 2020 to final judgment (“Aggrieved Employees”).

2. BHFC Operating LLC and/or DOES 1 through 25 (collectively “Defendants”) operate restaurants in the State of California.

3. Plaintiff alleges, on behalf of herself and the Aggrieved Employees, that Defendants systematically deprived their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees of the overtime wages and minimum wages to which they were entitled by requiring them to perform work duties off-the-clock. In addition, Defendants failed to correctly calculate the overtime rate of pay by failing to include non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and/or non-discretionary performance pay in the regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation.

4. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all of the meal and rest periods to which they were entitled. Moreover, on occasions when Defendants issued a premium payment pursuant to California Labor Code 226.7(b), Defendants failed to do so at the correct rate by failing to include non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and incentive pay in the regular rate of compensation.

5. Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses, including, but not limited to, the use of personal cell phones for work-related purposes, costs incurred to comply with Respondent’s dress code, and food handler training.

6. As a result, Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks to recover all available remedies under PAGA, including, but not limited to, civil

1 penalties and attorney's fees and costs.

2 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
4 Article VI, section 10. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis
5 for jurisdiction.

6 8. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief,
7 Defendants are citizens and residents of California, regularly conduct business in California, have
8 sufficient minimum contacts in California, and/or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the
9 California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by California courts consistent
10 with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Further, no federal question is at issue
11 because the claims asserted herein are based solely on California law.

12 9. Venue is proper in the judicial district and the County of Los Angeles, California,
13 because Plaintiff and many of the Aggrieved Employees worked for Defendants in the County of Los
14 Angeles. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals,
15 and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

16 **THE PARTIES**

17 10. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff was a resident of the County of Los Angeles,
18 State of California.

19 11. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant BHFC Operating LLC, a California limited
20 liability company, was and is an employer whose employees are engaged in the State of California,
21 including the County of Los Angeles.

22 12. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein under
23 the fictitious names DOES 1 through 25 but will seek leave of this Court to amend the complaint and
24 serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

25 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each and all of the
26 acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to Defendants BHFC
27 Operating LLC and/or DOES 1 through 25, each acting as the agent, employee, alter ego, and/or joint
28 venturer of, or working in concert with, each of the other co-Defendants and within the course and

1 scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity with legal authority to act on
2 the others' behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants represent and were in accordance with
3 Defendants' official policy.

4 14. At all relevant times, Defendants were the employers of Plaintiff within the meaning
5 of all applicable state laws and statutes. Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the
6 working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff so as to make
7 each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

8 15. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
9 Employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees'
10 employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

11 16. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's
12 and the Aggrieved Employees' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the
13 Aggrieved Employees.

14 17. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees.

16 18. Defendants continue to employ hourly paid and/or non-exempt employees within the
17 State of California.

18 19. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or
19 omission complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted
20 the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein
21 alleged.

22 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said
23 Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts,
24 omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

25 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

26 21. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt, hourly-paid
27 Server in the County of Los Angeles. Plaintiff started working for Defendants on or about January 1,
28 2014. Plaintiff was temporarily laid off from approximately March 17, 2020 to February 2021 due to

1 the COVID-19 pandemic. Plaintiff resumed working for Defendants in or around February 2021 until
2 approximately September 8, 2021. Plaintiff worked at Defendants' restaurants located in downtown
3 Los Angeles and in West Hollywood.

4 22. Defendants hired Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees but failed to properly pay
5 them all overtime wages and minimum wages due, failed to provide them with all meal periods and
6 rest periods to which they were entitled, failed to timely pay them all wages during their employment,
7 failed to timely pay them all wages due upon termination of their employment, failed to provide them
8 with accurate itemized wage statements, failed to maintain accurate payroll records, failed to
9 reimburse them for necessary business expenses, and failed to provide and adhere to other related
10 protections afforded by the California Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
11 ("IWC") Wage Order.

12 23. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or
13 forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

14 24. In addition to their base hourly rate of pay, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
15 earned non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and/or incentive pay.

16 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
17 should have known that pursuant to California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and the applicable
18 IWC Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive certain wages for
19 overtime compensation and that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not receiving certain
20 wages for overtime compensation. By way of example, Defendants required Plaintiff and the
21 Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock. This off-the-clock work includes, but is not limited to,
22 receiving and responding to work phone calls and text messages, setting tables, and providing
23 customer service. In addition, Defendants failed to correctly calculate the overtime rate of pay by
24 failing to include non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and/or non-discretionary
25 performance pay in the regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation.

26 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
27 should have known that pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and the
28 applicable IWC Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive at least

1 minimum wages for all hours worked and that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not
2 receiving minimum wages for all hours worked. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
3 Employees to perform work off-the-clock, including but not limited to, receiving and responding to
4 work phone calls and text messages, setting tables, and providing customer service.

5 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
6 should have known that pursuant to California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and the applicable
7 IWC Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive a meal period or
8 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation when they were not
9 provided with an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes for a work period of
10 more than five hours per day and that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive
11 a second meal period or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation
12 when they were not provided with an uninterrupted second meal period of no less than thirty (30)
13 minutes for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day. However, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
14 Employees did not receive all meal periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular
15 rate of compensation when a meal period was missed, shortened, taken late, and/or interrupted.

16 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
17 should have known that pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC
18 Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all rest periods or
19 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation when they were not
20 provided with an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four hours, or
21 major fraction thereof, worked. However, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive all
22 rest periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation when a
23 rest period was missed, shortened, taken late, and/or interrupted.

24 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
25 should have known that pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
26 Employees were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment. Plaintiff and the
27 Aggrieved Employees did not receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime
28 wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within

1 permissible time periods.

2 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
3 should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all wages
4 upon termination of employment, including, without limitation, overtime wages, minimum wages,
5 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages, and that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
6 Employees did not receive payment of all wages upon termination of employment in violation of
7 California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

8 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew
9 or should have known that they were required to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
10 with complete and accurate itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section
11 226, but failed to do so.

12 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew
13 or should have known that pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174, Defendants had to keep
14 complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with
15 California law, but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

16 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew
17 or should have known pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 that Plaintiff and
18 the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses,
19 but, in fact, did not reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for necessary business-related
20 expenses, including, but not limited to, the use of personal cell phones for work-related purposes,
21 costs incurred to comply with Respondent's dress code, and food handler training.

22 34. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California enacted
23 Emergency Rule 9 to the California Rules of Court, which provided that, notwithstanding any other
24 law, the statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled
25 from April 6, 2020, until October 1, 2020.

26 **PAGA ALLEGATIONS**

27 35. At all times set forth herein, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by
28 Defendants.

1 36. At all times set forth herein, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the
2 California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty, including unpaid wages and premium wages,
3 to be assessed and collected by the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”)
4 for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action
5 brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of herself and other current or former employees pursuant
6 to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

7 37. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action may be brought by an “aggrieved employee,” who is
8 any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged
9 violations was committed.

10 38. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violations were committed
11 against her during her time of employment and she is, therefore, an aggrieved employee. Plaintiff and
12 the other employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c)
13 in that they are current or former employees of Defendants and one of more of the alleged violations
14 were committed against them.

15 39. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee,
16 including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements
17 have been met:

18 (a) The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by certified mail (hereinafter
19 “Employee’s Notice”) to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of the
20 Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
21 alleged violations.

22 (b) The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter “LWDA Notice”) to the employer and the
23 aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged
24 violation within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice.
25 Upon receipt of the LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-
26 five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice, the aggrieved
27 employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699
28

1 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be
2 entitled.

3 40. On September 15, 2021, Plaintiff provided notice by electronic submission to the
4 LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged
5 to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, pursuant to
6 Labor Code section 2699.3.

7 41. Therefore, the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section
8 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies for violations of
9 California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197,
10 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802 will have been satisfied upon expiration of the sixty-five day notice
11 period.

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2698, Et Seq.**

14 **(Against BHFC OPERATING LLC and DOES 1-25)**

15 42. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
16 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

17 43. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code which
18 provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its departments,
19 divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the California Labor Code,
20 may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or
21 herself, and other current or former employees.

22 44. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
23 agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to
24 exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

25 45. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are “Aggrieved Employees”
26 as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees
27 of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

28 46. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous sections of the California

1 Labor Code, including, but not limited to, the following:

- 2 (a) Violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 for failure to pay
3 overtime wages, as set forth more fully below;
- 4 (b) Violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 for failure to
5 pay minimum wages, as set forth more fully below;
- 6 (c) Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to provide
7 legally required meal periods, as set forth more fully below;
- 8 (d) Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to provide legally
9 required rest periods, as set forth more fully below;
- 10 (e) Violation of California Labor Code section 204 for failure to timely pay wages to
11 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during employment, as set forth more fully
12 before;
- 13 (f) Violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 for failure to pay all
14 wages at time of discharge from employment, as set forth more fully below;
- 15 (g) Violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) for failure to provide accurate
16 wage statements to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as set forth more fully
17 below;
- 18 (h) Violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) for failure to keep complete
19 and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as set
20 forth more fully below; and
- 21 (i) Violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse
22 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business-related expenses, as set
23 forth more fully below.

24 47. Pursuant to PAGA, and in particular Labor Code sections 2699(a), 2699.3, and 2699.5,
25 Plaintiff, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seeks assessment and collection of
26 civil penalties for Plaintiff, all Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California against Defendants,
27 in addition to other remedies, for violations of Labor Code sections set forth herein. Pursuant to
28 California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by Aggrieved Employees shall be

distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the LWDA for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five (25%) to the Aggrieved Employees. Further, and as authorized by the California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5, and 2699, Plaintiff seeks recovery of her attorneys' fees and costs.

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

48. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order have provided that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

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

50. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees employed by Defendants, and working more than twelve (12) hours in a day, overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay.

51. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

52. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week performing work duties "off-the-clock," including, but not limited to receiving and responding to work phone calls and text messages, setting tables, and providing customer service.

53. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to correctly calculate the overtime rate of pay by failing to include non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and/or non-discretionary performance pay in the regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation.

1 54. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees the unpaid balance of
2 overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of California Labor
3 Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

4 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

5 55. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 have
6 provided that the minimum wage for employees fixed by the IWC is the minimum wage to be paid to
7 employees, and the payment of a wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Defendants' failure
8 to pay minimum wages included, *inter alia*, Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
9 Employees any wages for time spent working "off-the-clock" performing duties, including, but not
10 limited to, receiving and responding to work phone calls and text messages, setting tables, and
11 providing customer service. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages
12 to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all of the hours they worked in violation of California Labor
13 Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.

14 56. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees the minimum wage as
15 required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.

16 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

17 57. At all relevant times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 226.7 has provided
18 that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable
19 IWC Order.

20 58. At all relevant times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 512(a) has
21 provided that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a period of more
22 than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty
23 (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6)
24 hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

25 59. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who were
26 scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally
27 mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours
28 without a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

60. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

61. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of ten (10) hours but no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work in excess of ten (10) hours without receiving a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

62. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of twelve (12) hours, were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

63. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for work performed during meal periods. By way of example, Defendants failed to relieve Plaintiff of all duties such that Plaintiff could take compliant meal periods. As a result, Plaintiff worked through mandated meal periods.

64. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the full meal period premium due in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 on each occasion when a timely, uninterrupted meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes was not provided. Defendants failed to incorporate all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the regular rate of compensation.

65. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order(s), and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

66. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 has provided that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order

1 of the California IWC.

2 67. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that “[e]very employer
3 shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in
4 the middle of each work period” and that the “rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked
5 daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof” unless
6 the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

7 68. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section
8 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants one (1)
9 additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that
10 the rest period was not provided.

11 69. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
12 Employees to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest
13 period per each four (4) hour period, or major fraction thereof worked. During the relevant time
14 period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work during rest
15 periods. By way of example, Defendants failed to relieve Plaintiff of all duties such that Plaintiff
16 could take compliant rest periods. As a result, Plaintiff worked through mandated rest periods.

17 70. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees the full rest period
18 premium due in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 on each occasion when a
19 timely, uninterrupted rest period of at least ten (10) minutes was not provided. Defendants failed to
20 incorporate all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
21 Employees in the regular rate of compensation.

22 71. Defendants’ conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor
23 Code section 226.7.

24 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

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

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

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

8 75. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay
9 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages due to them, within any time period permissible
10 under California Labor Code section 204, including wages for overtime compensation, minimum wage
11 compensation, meal period premiums, and rest period premiums.

12 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

13 76. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203, Defendants are required
14 to pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code section
15 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid
16 at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202
17 mandates that if an employee quits, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than
18 seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours notice of
19 his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of
20 quitting.

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

26 78. At the time that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees' employment with Defendants
27 ended, including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or
28 resigned, Defendants knowingly and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all

1 wages owed to them pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including, without
2 limitation, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium
3 wages.

4 **Failure to Provide Compliant Wage Statements**

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

18 80. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete
19 and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to state all
20 correct rates of pay, all hours worked, all meal period premium wages earned, and all rest period
21 premium wages earned.

22 **Failure to Keep Requisite Payroll Records**

23 81. At all relevant times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 1174(d) has
24 required an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at
25 which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages
26 paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees
27 employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with
28 rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less

1 than two years.

2 82. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete
3 payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
4 Employees.

5 83. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d), Plaintiff
6 and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

7 84. More specifically, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been injured by
8 Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) because they
9 were denied both their legal right and protected interest, in having available, accurate and complete
10 payroll records pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d).

11 **Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses**

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

16 86. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses
17 and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants, including, but not limited to, the use of
18 personal cell phones for work-related purposes, costs incurred to comply with Respondent's dress
19 code, and food handler training.

20 87. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
21 Employees for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

3 1. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f), and (g), plus
4 costs and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a),
5 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802; and

6 2. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

7 Respectfully Submitted,

8 Dated: September 15, 2021

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

9
10 By: 

11 Jonathan M. Genish
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff Alexis Cardoza
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28