

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Peter J. Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 295611]
peter@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
4590 Allstate Drive
Riverside, CA 92501
Tel: (951) 320-1444 || Fax: (951) 320-1445

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

DANIEL DOMINGUEZ, on behalf of all
Aggrieved Employees and the State of
California;

Plaintiff,

vs.

KENCO LOGISTIC SERVICES, LLC, a
Delaware Limited Liability Company; and
DOES 1 through 20, inclusive;

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **CVRI2105393**

**REPRESENTATIVE ENFORCEMENT
ACTION COMPLAINT [Private
Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"),
Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*]**

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Pay Vested Vacation;
- (6) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
- (7) Failure to Timely Pay Wages;
- (8) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages; and
- (9) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff Daniel Dominguez (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all other similarly
2 Aggrieved Employees and the State of California. hereby brings this Private Attorneys General
3 Act (“PAGA”) Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants, as follows.¹

4 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against his former employers, Defendants Kenco
6 Logistic Services, LLC and/or DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively, “Defendants”) on
7 behalf of all current and former non-exempt employees employed by Defendants in California
8 within the last one year and 65-days prior to the filing of this action (hereinafter, the “Aggrieved
9 Employees”) and who were subjected to violations of the California Labor Code stemming from
10 Defendants’ failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide compliant
11 meal periods and rest breaks, failure to pay vested vacation upon separation of employment,
12 failure to timely pay wages each period, failure to timely pay final wages, and failure to provide
13 accurate itemized wage statements.

14 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately April through August
15 2021.

16 3. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Aggrieved Employees were
17 subjected to the same policies, practices, and corresponding wage and hour violations to which
18 he was subjected during his employment.

19 4. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
20 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
21 worked. As one such example, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to
22 undergo mandatory COVID-19 health screening prior to clocking in for payroll purposes.
23 However, because this time was spent under Defendants’ control but before being allowed to
24 clock in, it was uncompensated in violation of California law and led to minimum and overtime
25 wage violations. *See Troester v. Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law
26 “do[es] not allow employers to require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock
27

28 ¹ Because a PAGA action is aimed at deterring and punishing violations of the Labor Code, the State of California
“is always the real party in interest in the suit.” *Iskanian v. CLS Transp. of Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348,
360; *ZB, N.A. v. Superior Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, 185 (all PAGA claims “are brought on the state’s behalf”).

without compensation”); see also *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under company’s control and where the tasks served the employer’s interests).

5. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees on an hourly basis plus additional compensation in the form of shift differentials, nondiscretionary bonuses, and other payments. However, on the occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 8 and/or 12 hours per day and/or 40 hours per week and received additional nondiscretionary compensation during the workweek, Defendants failed to properly include these amounts in the calculations for the regular rate of pay. Therefore, Defendants failed to pay proper overtime compensation for the hours worked in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week.

6. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also denied 30-minute off-duty meal periods, as mandated by California law, during their employment with Defendants. As a result of Defendants’ policies and practices, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal period while under the control of Defendants, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4) forced to take a meal period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided a mandated second meal period on shifts in excess of 10 hours.

7. Similarly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were unable to leave the premises for rest breaks, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to the lack of adequate staffing and coverage and being overwhelmed by the hectic workload. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 10 hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a third mandated rest break. As such, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided rest period premiums for their missed or non-complaint rest periods

1 8. Moreover, on the occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were
2 denied compliant meal periods and rest breaks, Defendants failed to pay the “premium” required
3 under Labor Code § 226.7.

4 9. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants utilized a policy and practice through
5 which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees accrued vacation and/or PTO hours (collectively,
6 “vacation hours”). However, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had
7 accrued but unused vacation hours upon separation of employment, Defendants failed to pay
8 these wages and, further, failed to pay them at the “final rate” required by Labor Code § 227.3.

9 10. Defendants also required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to incur
10 necessary business-related expenses and costs without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff
11 and the Aggrieved Employees were often required to travel between two of Defendants’
12 warehouses on the same day, and incur mileage and gas expenses doing so, yet Defendants did
13 not reimburse the Aggrieved Employees for such expenses.

14 11. Plaintiff also alleges that he and the Aggrieved Employees were not paid all
15 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
16 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201–203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
17 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
18 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
19 minimum and regular wages, overtime wages, vacation wages, wage premiums, among others.

20 12. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
21 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

22 13. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
23 employer of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
24 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
25 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
26 hours and days of work in any Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as such, are
27 subject to penalties for each underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558.

28 ///

1 14. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees and the State of
2 California, as the real party in interest, to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies
3 for the violations of the California Labor Code alleged herein, as well as attorneys' fees, costs,
4 and/or other damages as permitted by PAGA. Plaintiff reserves the right to name additional
5 representatives throughout the State of California.

6 **II. JURISDICTION**

7 15. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the
8 Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

9 **III. VENUE**

10 16. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
11 Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in Riverside County and the unlawful acts
12 alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in Riverside
13 County. Furthermore, Defendants employed or employ the Aggrieved Employees in Riverside
14 County and alleged violations therefore occurred in Riverside County. Thus, venue is proper in
15 Riverside County. See *Crestwood Behavioral Health, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2021) 60
16 Cal.App.5th 1069, 1075 ("venue is proper in any county in which an aggrieved employee worked
17 and Labor Code violations allegedly occurred.").

18 **IV. PARTIES**

19 **Plaintiff**

20 17. Plaintiff and PAGA Representative Daniel Dominguez was employed by
21 Defendants as a nonexempt employee from approximately April through August 2021.

22 **Defendants**

23 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Kenco
24 Logistic Services, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company authorized to and doing business
25 in Riverside County, California, and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the
26 Aggrieved Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

27 19. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of
28 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20,

1 inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for
2 the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees by virtue of
3 Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious
4 names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE
5 Defendants when ascertained.

6 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he worked under the
7 joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and each of them, acted in all
8 respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint scheme,
9 business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally
10 attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a unity of interest and ownership
11 between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as a single employer of Plaintiff
12 and other similarly situated employees.

13 21. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
14 Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees and are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single employer because
16 these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human resources and personnel
17 policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally, Defendants also have a shared
18 website, common management, a centralized control of labor operations, and common ownership
19 or financial control.

20 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting
21 themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active
22 concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in
23 all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times
24 Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the
25 agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining
26 co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and
27 purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of
28 their remaining co-Defendants.

1 23. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants
2 have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate
3 corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which
4 Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly,
5 the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed
6 jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the
7 separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege,
8 thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

9 24. Additionally, Defendants DOES 11 through 20 are liable for PAGA civil penalties
10 under Labor Code § 558 as “other person(s)” who caused the wage violations among other
11 claims. See *Atempa v. Pedrazzani* (2018) 27 Cal.App.5th 809, 820 (“if there is evidence and a
12 finding that a party other than the employer ‘violates, or causes to be violated’ the overtime laws
13 or ‘pays or causes to be paid to any employee’ less than minimum wage, then that party is liable
14 for certain civil penalties regardless of the identity or business structure of the employer”)
15 (internal citations omitted); *Moua v. IBM* (N.D. Cal. 2019) 2019 U.S.Dist.LEXIS 40851 (same).

16 **V. LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CAUSES OF ACTION**
17 **(Labor Code §§ 2698 – 2699.5)**

18 25. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as he was employed by
19 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
20 violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil
21 action filed on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved
22 employees against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

23 26. Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to
24 Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by
25 PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court
26 in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Therefore, Plaintiff is not required to, nor
27 does she, seek class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

28 ///

27. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), on or about September 14, 2021, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Now that sixty-five (65) days have elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice of the claims alleged herein without the LWDA assuming jurisdiction over the claims alleged, Plaintiff has fully satisfied her administrative prerequisites for bringing suit under the PAGA.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

28. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

29. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each hour worked.

30. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked.

31. As one such example, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to undergo mandatory COVID-19 screening prior to clocking in for payroll purposes. However, because this time was spent under Defendants' control but before being allowed to clock in, it was uncompensated in violation of California law and led to minimum and overtime wage violations. See *Troester v. Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law "do[es] not allow employers to require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without compensation"); see also *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under company's control and where the tasks served the employer's interests).

/ / /

1 32. As a result of Defendants' policies or practices described above, Plaintiff and the
2 Aggrieved Employees were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew
3 or should have known they were performing.

4 33. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
5 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
6 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

7 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
8 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
9 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

10 35. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
11 Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each
12 hour worked, including proper minimum wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in
13 accordance thereto.

14 36. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
15 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
16 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

19 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

20 37. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
21 alleged herein.

22 38. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did
23 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

24 39. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
25 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
26 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
27 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
28 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)

1 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

2 40. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by
3 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to
4 the reasons discussed herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive proper
5 overtime compensation.

6 41. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided
7 proper overtime wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all
8 hours worked.

9 42. As one such example, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
10 Employees to undergo mandatory COVID-19 screening prior to clocking in for payroll purposes.
11 However, because this time was spent under Defendants' control but before being allowed to
12 clock in, it was uncompensated in violation of California law and led to minimum and overtime
13 wage violations. See *Troester v. Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law
14 "do[es] not allow employers to require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock
15 without compensation"); see also *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are
16 compensable when employee is under company's control and where the tasks served the
17 employer's interests).

18 43. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
19 Employees on an hourly basis plus additional nondiscretionary compensation in the form of shift
20 differentials, bonuses, and other payments. However, on the occasions when Plaintiff and the
21 Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 8 and/or 12 hours per day and/or 40 hours per week
22 and received additional nondiscretionary compensation during the workweek, Defendants failed
23 to properly include these amounts in the calculations for the regular rate of pay. Therefore,
24 Defendants failed to pay proper overtime compensation for the hours worked in excess of 8
25 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week.

26 44. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
27 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because
28 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per

1 week without proper overtime compensation.

2 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
3 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
4 Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

5 46. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
6 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
7 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

8 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

10 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

11 47. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
12 alleged herein.

13 48. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were "non-exempt" employees
14 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing
15 mandatory meal periods.

16 49. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide non-
17 exempt employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

18 50. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
19 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
20 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
21 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
22 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
23 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
24 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

25 51. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
26 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
27 pay for each meal period that is missed.

28 ///

1 52. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were denied
2 the 30-minute off-duty meal periods that they were entitled to under California law.

3 53. As a result of Defendants' policies and practices, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
4 Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable to take a meal
5 period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal period while under the control of
6 Defendants, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4) forced to take a meal period after the
7 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided a mandated second meal period on shifts in excess of 10
8 hours.

9 54. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
10 Order every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Plaintiff
11 and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all mandatory meal periods and
12 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees one additional hour of
13 compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof. *See Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel,*
14 *LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858 (meal and rest premiums must be paid at the "regular rate").

15 55. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
16 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
17 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
18 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
19 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
20 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

21 56. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
22 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
23 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

24 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

26 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

27 57. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
28 alleged herein.

1 58. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “non-exempt” employees
2 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing
3 mandatory rest breaks.

4 59. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
5 breaks to its non-exempt employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare
6 Commission.

7 60. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
8 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
9 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
10 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
11 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

12 61. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
13 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff one additional hour of pay at her regular rate of
14 compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

15 62. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided
16 with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
17 mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and Plaintiff and the
18 Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were unable to leave the premises
19 for rest breaks, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were often not authorized and/or
20 permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to the lack of adequate staffing and coverage and
21 being overwhelmed by the hectic workload. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the
22 Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 10 hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize
23 and/or permit a third mandated rest break. As such, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
24 were not provided rest period premiums for their missed or non-complaint rest periods

25 63. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
26 Order every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Plaintiff
27 and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all mandatory rest periods and Defendants
28 failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees one additional hour of compensation in lieu

thereof at the regular rate of pay. *See Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858 (meal and rest premiums must be paid at the “regular rate”).

64. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY VESTED VACATION

(Labor Code § 227.3)

65. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

66. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the payment of vested vacation time and/or paid time off upon separation of employment.

67. Pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3, an employer that has implemented a paid vacation, paid time off, or compensated time off policy must, upon an employee’s separation from employment, pay to the employee all vested but unused vacation and/or paid time off at his final rate of pay.

68. At all relevant times, Defendants utilized a policy and practice through which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees accrued vacation hours. However, on the occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had accrued but unused vacation hours upon separation of employment, Defendants failed to pay for all accrued but unused vacation wages and, further, failed to for these earned wages at the “final rate” including applicable shift differentials and other nondiscretionary compensation, as required by Labor Code § 227.3.

69. As a result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive compensation for all accrued but unused vacation hours at the “final rate” upon separation of employment – in violation of Labor Code § 227.3.

///

///

70. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and any other damages permitted under the PAGA.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES

(Labor Code § 2802)

71. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

72. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing reimbursement of business expenses.

73. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of their employer.

74. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to incur substantial business-related expenses and costs without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were often required to travel between two of Defendants' warehouses on the same day, and incur mileage and gas expenses doing so, yet Defendants did not reimburse the Aggrieved Employees for such expenses.

75. At all relevant times herein, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for expenses incurred as a direct consequence of Plaintiff's employment with Defendant and/or under the direction of Defendants.

76. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under the PAGA.

/ / /

/ / /

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

3 (Labor Code § 204)

4 77. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
5 alleged herein.

6 78. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “non-exempt” employees
7 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the
8 timing of payment of wages each period.

9 79. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
10 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
11 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
12 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
13 the following month.

14 80. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states “[t]he requirements of this section shall
15 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
16 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.”

17 81. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the
18 Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited
19 to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums, within the
20 time specified by Labor Code § 204.

21 82. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
22 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
23 and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

24 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

26 (Labor Code §§ 201–203)

27 83. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
28 alleged herein.

1 84. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
2 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing and
3 payment of wages.

4 85. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
5 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

6 86. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
7 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
8 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

9 87. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
10 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
11 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

12 88. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby
13 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due and owing upon separation
14 of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

15 89. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all
16 wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees upon separation of employment,
17 including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, vacation wages, as well as
18 meal and rest period premiums.

19 90. Additionally, at all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay all mandated sick
20 wages owed to the Aggrieved Employees at the proper rate of pay.

21 91. Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees
22 must be “calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the
23 employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that
24 workweek.” Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be
25 “calculated by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the
26 employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.”

27 92. Here, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were compensated on an hourly
28 basis plus additional compensation in the form of shift differentials and/or nondiscretionary

1 compensation. However, on the occasions that the Aggrieved Employees took sick time and
2 received paid sick leave, Defendants only paid sick time at the base rate of pay (not factoring in
3 the additional compensation as required by Labor Code §§ 246(l)(1-2)), leading to unpaid wages
4 at the time of separation of employment.

5 93. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
6 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages due
7 and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

8 94. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
9 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
10 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

11 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

13 (Labor Code § 226)

14 95. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
15 alleged herein.

16 96. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
17 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of
18 accurate itemized wage statements.

19 97. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
20 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
21 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
22 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
23 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
24 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

25 98. Defendants violates Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to
26 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees due to violations including: failure to accurately state
27 total hours worked (the wage statements failed to accurately reflect the compensable hours spent
28 in temperature checks); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to accurately state

all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay); and failure to accurately state the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

99. Additionally, Defendants' wage statements directly violated Labor Code § 226(a)(9) each period because they failed to accurately state the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate. Specifically, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees often received shift differentials for every hour worked at a set rate of pay. These shift differentials were indisputably an "applicable hourly rate" in effect during the periods when they were earned, yet Defendants' wage statements failed to provide any information regarding the rate of pay or number of hours worked at the shift differential hourly rate – in direct violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

100. Therefore, at all relevant times, Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and each and every one of the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants' wage statements failed to accurately state all information required by § 226(a). And, unlike class action claims, PAGA claims need not meet the "injury" and "knowing and intentional" violation requirements of § 226(e). See *Lopez v. Friant & Associates, LLC* (2017) 15 Cal.App.5th 773, 788 ("a plaintiff seeking civil penalties under PAGA for a violation of section 226(a) does not have to satisfy the "injury" and "knowing and intentional" requirements of section 226(e)(1)"); *Lawson v. ZB, N.A.* (2017) 18 Cal.App.5th 705, 722 ("the scienter requirement [of § 226(e)] has no application in a PAGA claim for violation of [§ 226(a)]").

101. As a result of the Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA, including the \$250 penalty per violation specified by Labor Code § 226.3. See *Raines v. Coastal Pacific Food Distributors, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 667, 675 ("Section 226.3 provides the civil penalty for failure to comply" with Labor Code § 226).

///

///

1 **VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 4 1. For the assessment of all remedies and/or penalties available under the PAGA;
5 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit to the extent permitted by law; and
6 3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

7 **VII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial as to the First through Ninth Causes
9 of Action pled herein.

10 Dated: November 19, 2021

LAUBY. MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

11
12 BY:



13 Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
14 Peter J. Carlson, Esq.
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Aggrieved
16 Employees
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28