

Justin F. Marquez (SBN 262417)
justin@wilshirelawfirm.com
Benjamin H. Haber (SBN 315664)
benjamin@wilshirelawfirm.com
Maxim Gorbunov (SBN 343128)
mgorbunov@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN**

RAUL MORALES REYES and MARIANO
GUTIERREZ GAMA, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GIUMARRA VINEYARDS CORPORATION, a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: BCV-21-102139

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum, Straight Time Wages, and Other Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 204b, 226.2, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
5. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226);
7. Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures (Cal. Lab. Code § 2802);
8. Unlawful Deductions (Cal. Lab. Code § 221);
9. Paid Sick Leave and Paid COVID Supplemental Sick Leave Violations (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 246, 248.2, 248.6);
10. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and
11. Civil Penalties Under PAGA (Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, *et seq.*)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs Raul Morales Reyes and Mariano Gutierrez Gama (“Plaintiffs”), based upon facts
2 that either have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable
3 opportunity for further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendant GIUMARRA VINEYARDS
6 CORPORATION and Does 1 through 10 (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for
7 California Labor Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure
8 to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal
9 periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay final wages, and failure
10 to furnish accurate wage statements, failure to indemnify employees for expenditures, unlawful
11 deductions, and violations of California sick leave and COVID-19 supplemental sick leave laws.

12 2. Plaintiffs bring the First through Tenth Causes of Action individually and as a class
13 action on behalf of themselves and certain current and former employees of Defendants
14 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” and defined more fully
15 below). The Class consists of Plaintiffs and all other persons who have been employed by any
16 Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations
17 period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

18 3. Plaintiffs bring the Eleventh Cause of Action as a representative action under the
19 California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
20 Plaintiffs, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt employees by Defendants in
21 the State of California (hereinafter referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”) during the statute of
22 limitations period for their PAGA claim.

23 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
24 establishment within the State of California, including Kern County. As such, and based upon all
25 the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are subject
26 to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”),
27 and the California Business & Professions Code.

28 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained

1 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 2 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum,
3 straight time, rest and recovery period time, nonproductive time, and
4 overtime in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
5 Orders;
- 6 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
7 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
8 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing
9 to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation
10 occurred;
- 11 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
12 and recovery periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC
13 Wage Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday
14 a rest period violation occurred;
- 15 (d) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum, straight time, overtime,
16 meal period premium, and rest and recovery period premium wages due
17 within the time period specified by California law when employment
18 terminates;
- 19 (e) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
20 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
21 IWC Wage Orders;
- 22 (f) Failing to indemnify employees for expenditures incurred in direct discharge
23 of duties of employment;
- 24 (g) Unlawfully deducting employees' wages; and,
- 25 (h) Committing violations of laws governing the provision of paid sick leave
26 and/or COVID-19 supplemental sick leave;

27 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
28 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their

unlawful policies. Defendants’ violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior.”

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

8. Plaintiffs Raul Morales Reyes and Mariano Gutierrez Gama are residents of Kern County, California who worked for Defendants in Bakersfield, California as hourly-paid, non-exempt employees during the statutory periods applicable to their claims.¹

9. Plaintiffs reserve the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new Plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

B. Defendants

10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief allege, that Defendant GIUMARRA VINEYARDS CORPORATION is, and at all times herein mentioned, was:

- (a) A business entity qualified to do business and actually conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Kern County; and,
- (b) The former employer of Plaintiffs, and the current and/or former employer of the putative Class, and the current and/or former employers of the Aggrieved Employees because Defendant GIUMARRA VINEYARDS CORPORATION suffered and permitted Plaintiffs, the Class, and the

¹ In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California adopted Emergency Rule 9(a) (California Rules of Court), whereby “statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 to October 1, 2020.”

Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

11. Plaintiffs do not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of California.

13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

14. Plaintiffs worked for Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employees until at least April 2020 (in the case of Plaintiff Reyes) and until at least July 2021 (in

1 the case of Plaintiff Gama). During Plaintiffs' employment for Defendants, Defendants paid
2 Plaintiffs an hourly wage and classified them as non-exempt from overtime. Defendants typically
3 scheduled Plaintiffs to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but
4 Plaintiffs mostly worked more than eight hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a
5 workweek.

6 15. Throughout Plaintiffs' employment, Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked
7 (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiffs with legally
8 compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take rest periods, failed to
9 timely pay all final wages to Plaintiffs when Defendants terminated their employment, failed to
10 furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs, and failed to indemnify Plaintiffs for expenditures.
11 As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

12 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
13 paying Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum,
14 straight time, rest and recovery period, nonproductive time, and overtime wages. Defendants
15 required them to work "off-the-clock", uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiffs, the
16 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work unpaid during legally required meal periods and after
17 clocking out for the workday. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime
18 rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of
19 the hours Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

20 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs,
21 the Class, and Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and
22 duty-free meal period. They routinely worked through meal periods "off-the-clock," and
23 Defendants frequently paid them less than all their work time. Much of this unpaid work should
24 have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed
25 to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
26 worked. Defendants also regularly, but not always, required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
27 Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-
28 minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without

1 compensating them for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or
2 tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over them by requiring,
3 pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without
4 working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying them permission to take a meal
5 period. Defendants also never informed Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees of their
6 right to, nor permitted them to take, a second meal period when they worked at least ten hours of
7 work in a workday. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was not to provide meal periods
8 to them in compliance with California law. When Defendants committed such violations,
9 Defendants failed to pay meal period premiums pursuant to Labor Code §226.7 or, when they did,
10 failed to pay those premiums at the correct rate of pay.

11 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
12 and permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest and
13 recovery periods. Defendants regularly required them to work in excess of four consecutive hours
14 a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-
15 free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without
16 compensating them for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants
17 continued to assert control over Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring,
18 pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without
19 working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying them permission to take a rest
20 period. Defendants also failed to authorize and permit duty free recovery periods when
21 circumstances required. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and
22 permit them to take rest and recovery periods in compliance with California law. When Defendants
23 committed such violations, Defendants failed to pay rest and/or recovery period premiums pursuant
24 to Labor Code §226.7 or, when they did, failed to pay those premiums at the correct rate of pay.

25 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
26 pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees all regular and final wages due at their
27 termination of employment. In addition, their final paychecks did not include payment for all
28 expenditures, minimum wages, straight time wages, rest and recovery wages, nonproductive time

wages, unpaid and due paid sick leave and/or COVID-19 supplemental sick leave wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest and recovery period premium wages owed to them by Defendants on their regularly scheduled paydays or at the conclusion of their employment. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to timely pay their regular and final wages when due was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead consistent with Defendants' policy and practice that applied to Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees.

20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, rest and recovery wages and the correct rates of pay, and nonproductive time wages and the correct rates of pay). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they were entitled;
- (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;
- (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were entitled;
- (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium

wages owed to them;

- (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;
- (g) by understating the wages truly due to them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wage rates to which Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and they were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e).

21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully required Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including, without limitation, work tools/equipment and use of personal cell phones.

22. Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to them for these employment-related expenses.

23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully deducted wages due and owing to Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees.

24. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants violated the rights of Plaintiffs, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees with respect to laws governing the provision of paid sick leave and/or COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

25. Plaintiffs bring certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

26. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiffs seek relief authorized by California law.

27. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years and 178 days before the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class is sent.

28. At all material times, Plaintiffs were members of the Class.

29. Plaintiffs undertake this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

30. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is readily ascertainable:

- (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be greater than forty (40) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.
- (b) Typicality: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiffs' claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.
- (c) Adequacy: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated

herein. Plaintiffs have no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiffs' attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiffs have incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

(d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and,
- 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

31. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without

limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, rest and recovery period time, nonproductive time, and overtime wages;
- (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
- (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest and recovery periods and pay rest and recovery period premium wages to Class Members;
- (d) Failed to provide Class Members with timely final wages;
- (e) Failed to provide Class Members with accurate wage statements;
- (f) Failed to indemnify Class Members for expenditures;
- (g) Unlawfully deducted Class Members' wages;
- (h) Violated Class Members' rights under laws governing the provision of paid sick leave and/or COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave; and,
- (i) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

32. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiffs, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable

1 relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation
2 for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an
3 amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for
4 the injuries sustained;

5 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual
6 members of the class would create a risk of:

7 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
8 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
9 of conduct for Defendants; and/or,

10 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
11 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members
12 not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or
13 impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not
14 limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those
15 parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,

16 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
17 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
18 the class as a whole.

19 33. Plaintiffs contemplate the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
20 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own
21 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated
22 notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiffs contemplate the use of
23 additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail
24 notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the
25 Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages for All Hours Worked)

34. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

35. “Hours worked” is 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.

36. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiffs and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 1194, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

37. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover minimum, straight time, rest and recovery time, and nonproductive time wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

38. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiffs and the Class have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

39. By virtue of the Defendants’ unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiffs and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiffs and the Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiffs and the Class and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

40. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code § 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage compensation due Plaintiffs and the Class.

41. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages.

42. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all

1 wages due and payable twice a month. California Labor Code §204b provides that §204 is
2 inapplicable to employers who pay on a weekly basis and sets forth certain rules regarding
3 employers who pay on a weekly basis. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to
4 this cause of action, Plaintiffs and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required
5 by law, including minimum and straight time wages, or on a schedule that complied with Labor
6 Code §204b. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay
7 Plaintiffs and the Class all such wages due and failed to pay those wages twice a month, or
8 according to the schedule set forth in Labor Code §204b.

9 43. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum and
10 straight time wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor
11 Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

14 44. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all
15 preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

16 45. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
17 employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they
18 receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

19 46. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall
20 not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional
21 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
22 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed
23 by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

24 47. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiffs and the Class have worked more than eight
25 hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as employees of Defendants.

26 48. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Class
27 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
28 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198.

49. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate compensation to the Plaintiffs and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiffs and the Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

50. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to Plaintiffs and the Class.

51. Plaintiffs and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

52. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. California Labor Code §204b provides that §204 is inapplicable to employers who pay on a weekly basis and sets forth certain rules regarding employers who pay on a weekly basis. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Class with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204 and/or California Labor Code §204b.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)

53. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

54. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiffs and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of Plaintiffs and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. California Labor Code

§ 512, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

55. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

56. Under California law, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s), plus interest thereon. Plaintiffs and the Class did not receive such additional wages when due and, to the extent they did, such wages were not paid at the correct rate.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest and Recovery Periods)

57. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

58. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours) and additional recovery periods when circumstances require. California Labor Code § 512, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten minutes each for each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage Order.

59. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiffs and the

Class to take rest breaks and recovery periods, regardless of whether employees worked more than four hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs and the Class to take rest and recovery periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest and recovery periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

60. Under California law, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s), plus interest thereon. Plaintiffs and the Class did not receive such additional wages when due and, to the extent they did, such wages were not paid at the correct rate.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time Penalties)

61. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

62. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

63. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of many other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

64. Defendants' failure to pay those Class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72)

hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

65. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

66. The Class is entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

67. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, the Class is also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)

68. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all preceding allegations in this Complaint.

69. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (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 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (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. Additionally, Labor Code §226.2

requires certain information regarding employees' rest and recovery period time and wages and nonproductive time and wages to be set forth in the wage statement required by Labor Code §226.

70. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiffs and the Class, the failure to list the true "total hours worked by the employee," and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

71. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiffs and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

72. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

73. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiffs and the Class is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiffs and the Class were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

74. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

75. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures)

76. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

77. As set forth above, Plaintiffs and the Class were required to incur substantial

1 necessary expenditures and losses in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their
2 obedience to directions of Defendants.

3 78. Defendants violated California Labor Code § 2802, by failing to pay and indemnify
4 Plaintiffs and the Class for necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the
5 discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

6 79. As a result, Plaintiffs and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of the
7 expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

8 80. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, expenses, and costs
9 of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802(c) and interest pursuant to California Labor Code
10 § 2802(b).

11 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Against all Defendants for Unlawful Deductions)**

13 81. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all
14 preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

15 82. Labor Code sections 221-225.5 makes it unlawful for employers to collect or receive
16 from an employee any part of wages paid by said employer to said employee absent an appropriate
17 authorization, from the employee or under the law, to deduct said wages. Applicable IWC Wage
18 Order(s), including but not limited to Wage Order 3-2001 and 9-2001, provide that "[n]o employer
19 shall make any deduction from the wage or require any reimbursement from an employee for any
20 cash shortage, breakage, or loss of equipment, unless it can be shown that the shortage, breakage,
21 or loss is caused by a dishonest or willful act, or by the gross negligence of the employee."

22 83. Plaintiffs and Class Members were subject to illegal deductions from their
23 compensation by Defendants, including but not limited to auto-deducted meal periods not received
24 by Plaintiffs and Class Members in violation of California law.

25 84. Such deductions were not for any act caused by a dishonest or willful act, or by the
26 gross negligence, of Plaintiffs and Class Members, nor were such deductions authorized by state
27 or federal law, or expressly in writing by an employee or any applicable collective bargaining
28 agreement.

85. Defendants' actions violated California law, including but not limited to Labor Code sections 221-225.5, 400-410, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Plaintiffs and Class Members are, therefore, entitled to reimbursement for, and repayment of, these deductions, plus interest, applicable penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Violations of Paid Sick Leave Laws)

86. 88. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

87. Labor Code §§ 246, 248.2, and 248.6 provided Plaintiffs and the Class rights to certain paid sick leave and COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave. Those laws detail the rate of pay at which such leave was to be paid by Defendants to Plaintiffs and the Class, as well as notices, whether in Plaintiffs' and the Class' wage statements or in a separate writing, relating to such leave. Labor Code §§247 and 247.5 govern the postings of notice related to sick leave rights and records related to use of sick leave.

88. During the statutory period, Defendants violated said provisions of the Labor Code by failing to accurately pay employees for sick leave and/or COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave, by failing to provide accurate notice to Plaintiffs and the Class of matters relating to such leave in their wage statements or in a separate writing, failing to post legally required notices related to such leave, and failing to keep accurate records relating to the use of such leave.

89. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct, Plaintiffs and Class Members have sustained damages in an amount to be established at trial, plus related penalties, prejudgment interest, attorney's fees, and costs pursuant to statute.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

90. Plaintiffs incorporates by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

91. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business

& Professions Code § 17201.

92. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiffs seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

93. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

94. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy; and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages

95. Defendants' failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

96. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

97. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

98. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with

California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Indemnify Business Expenses

99. Defendants' failure to reimburse expenses incurred in accordance with California Labor Code § 2802, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

Unlawful Deductions

100. Defendants' unlawful deductions, as alleged above, constitute unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§17200, *et seq.*

Sick Leave Violations

101. Defendants violations of laws pertaining to paid sick leave and/or COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§17200, *et seq.*

102. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiffs, and all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiffs, and all persons similarly situated, of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

103. Plaintiffs and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

104. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, are entitled to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiffs and the Class have been deprived, by means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiffs and the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

105. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above-described business practices are unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,

1 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices
2 in the future.

3 106. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no
4 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
5 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.
6 As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiffs,
7 individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, have suffered and will continue to
8 suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to
9 engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

10 107. Plaintiffs also allege that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
11 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
12 withholdings.

13 108. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiffs and
14 putative Class Members is entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants
15 during a period that commences four years and 178 days prior to the filing of this complaint; a
16 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiffs and Class
17 Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and
18 other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

19 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
21 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 *et seq.*)**

22 109. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein all
23 preceding allegations set forth in this Complaint.

24 110. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
25 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

26 111. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
27 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law,
28 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor

1 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
2 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
3 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
4 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

5 112. Plaintiffs have exhausted their administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
6 Code § 2699.3. Plaintiffs gave written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail
7 to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants violated against
8 Plaintiffs and current and former Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support
9 the violations. Plaintiffs also paid the filing fee.

10 113. The LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code
11 violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiffs may commence a civil action to recover
12 penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code
13 described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under
14 California Labor Code §§ 210, 225.5, 226.3, 248.5, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 1199, and 2699, and
15 Section 20 of 8 C.C.R. §11080 and/or §18 of 8 C.C.R. §11140, or other penalties that may be
16 available for violations of the statutory provisions alleged in Plaintiffs’ letter to the LWDA.

17 114. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award
18 of civil penalties on behalf of themselves, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved
19 Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to
20 be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted
21 by law.

22 115. In addition, Plaintiffs seek an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs pursuant
23 to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, “Any employee who prevails in any action
24 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.”

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Causes of Action;
2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as the representative of the Class; and,
3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel.

As to the First Cause of Action

4. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 226.2, and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum and other wages due;
5. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
7. For liquidated damages;
8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due;
11. For unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;
12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Third Cause of Action

15. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

20. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;

26. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;

27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

31. For all actual damages, according to proof;

32. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

33. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

34. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

35. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code § 2802 by willfully failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;

37. For unpaid wages or unreimbursed business expenses as may be appropriate;

38. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

39. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

40. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

41. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §221 by unlawfully deducting employees' wages;

42. For restitution of all unlawfully deducted wages as may be appropriate;

43. For pre-judgment interest on any unlawfully deducted wages commencing from the date of such unlawful deduction;

44. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

///

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

46. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§246, 248.2, and 248.6, by failing to pay out sick leave when due, at the correct rates, and by failing to provide employees' accurate notices, as required by law, of information pertaining to their sick leave;

47. For restitution of all underpaid sick leave benefits;

48. For pre-judgment interest on any underpaid sick leave benefits commencing from the date of such underpayment;

49. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

50. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

51. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest and recovery periods, failing to indemnify employees for expenditures, unlawfully deducting or withholding wages, and failing to comply with paid sick leave laws;

52. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

53. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

54. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

55. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

56. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

///

///

As to the Eleventh Cause of Action

57. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, nonproductive time, rest and recovery period time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods and pay the correct amount of meal period premium wages, failing to authorize and permit rest and recovery periods and pay the correct amount of rest period premium wages, failing to pay all regular and final wages to terminated employees, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to reimburse employees for all necessary business expenses, unlawfully deducting employees' wages, and violating employees' rights under paid sick leave laws.

58. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

59. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, et seq., and all other applicable Labor Code provisions or provisions of the applicable IWC Wage Order;

60. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699; and

61. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to all Causes of Action


62. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 2024

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

By:


Justin F. Marquez
Benjamin H. Haber
Maxim Gorbunov

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

///

///


///

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

Dated: June 4, 2024

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

By: 
Justin F. Marquez
Benjamin H. Haber
Maxim Gorbunov

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

PROOF OF SERVICE

Morales v. Giumarra Vineyards Corporation, et al.
BCV-21-102139 JEB

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, Rebecca Padilla, state that I am employed in the aforesaid County, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010. My electronic service address is rpadilla@wilshirelawfirm.com.

On June 4, 2024, I served the foregoing **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**, on the interested parties by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope by following one of the methods of service as follows:

Ian B. Wieland (SBN 285721)
ian@sw2law.com
Michael J. Conway (SBN 322030)
mikec@sw2law.com
Tristan Matthews
tristan@sw2law.com
SAGASER, WATKINS & WIELAND PC
5260 N. Palm Avenue, Suite 400
Fresno, California 93704
Telephone: (559) 421-7000
Facsimile: (559) 473-1483

Attorneys for Defendant

(X) **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known email address or e-mail of record in this action.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 4, 2024, at Los Angeles, California.



Rebecca Padilla