

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

2 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

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

2255 Calle Clara

4 La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

5 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

7 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

9
10 ALEJANDRO VALENZUELA and
11 ANGELEIGH MANJARREZ, on behalf of
the State of California, as private attorney
generals,

12
13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 BAMIA 2 LLC, a Limited Liability Company;
16 and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

17
18 Defendants.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ELECTRONICALLY

FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

03/25/2022

Clerk of the Court

BY: LAURA SIMMONS

Deputy Clerk

Case No. **CGC-22-598896**

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT
FOR:

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code
§ 2699, *et seq.* for violations of Labor
Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210,
212, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512,
558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
2802, California Code of Regulations,
Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-
(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

1 Plaintiffs Alejandro Valenzuela and Angeleigh Manjarrez (“PLAINTIFFS”), on behalf
2 of the people of the State of California and as “aggrieved employees” acting as private attorney
3 generals under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* (“PAGA”)
4 only, allege on information and belief, except for their own acts and knowledge which are based
5 on personal knowledge, the following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFFS bring this action against Bamia 2 LLC (“DEFENDANT”) seeking
8 only to recover PAGA civil penalties for themselves, and on behalf of all current and former
9 aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFFS do **not seek to recover**
10 **anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699**. To the extent
11 that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFFS do not seek
12 underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties
13 permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

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

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

22 **THE PARTIES**

23 4. Defendant Bamia 2 LLC (“DEFENDANT”) is a limited liability company that at
24 all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in
25 the state of California.

26 5. DEFENDANT’s neighborhood Kitchens enable restaurants – from local heroes
27 to national brands – to expand reaching thousands of new customers in the largest cities in
28

1 California. DEFENDANT provides turnkey delivery solutions for the preparation, distribution,
2 and expansion of food concepts.

3 6. Plaintiff Valenzuela was employed by DEFENDANT in California from April of
4 2021 until September of 2021 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt
5 employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and
6 payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

7 7. Plaintiff Manjarrez was employed by DEFENDANT in California from April of
8 2021 until October of 2021 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt
9 employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and
10 payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

11 8. PLAINTIFFS, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
12 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
13 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to
14 themselves and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in
15 California and who were classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES")
16 during the time period of October 14, 2020 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA
17 PERIOD").

18 9. PLAINTIFFS, on behalf of themselves and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
19 presently or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, bring this
20 representative action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* seeking fixed civil penalties for
21 DEFENDANT's violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 212,
22 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California
23 Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage
24 Order(s). Based upon the foregoing, PLAINTIFFS and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are
25 aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

26 10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
27 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently
28 unknown to PLAINTIFFS who therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names

1 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend this Complaint
2 to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are
3 ascertained. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe, and based upon that information and
4 belief allege, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,
5 inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that
6 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

15 **THE CONDUCT**

16 12. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
17 required to pay PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked,
18 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
19 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT required
20 PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the
21 time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically, DEFENDANT required
22 PLAINTIFFS to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be PLAINTIFFS' off-
23 duty meal break. PLAINTIFFS were from time to time interrupted by work assignments while
24 clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFFS and
25 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES also worked off the clock with respect to time spent
26 undergoing mandatory drug testing or any other testing and/or examination required as a
27 condition of employment. Additionally, before clocking in, PLAINTIFFS and the
28 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, were required to submit to the Covid-19 screening process.

1 PLAINTIFFS were not allowed to clock in until this process was completed. Also,
2 DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administered a
3 uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFFS and the
4 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course
5 of their employment, PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid less than
6 they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than “rounded”
7 time. DEFENDANT’s policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED
8 EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records. As a
9 result, DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
10 the proper minimum and overtime wages.

11 13. In addition, state law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and
12 rest break premiums at one-and-one-half times their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFFS and
13 the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay
14 that is tied to specific elements of an employee’s performance.

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

1 15. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFFS and the other
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in violation
3 of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other non-exempt employees
4 earn non-discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay,
5 DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
6 at their base rates of pay.

7 16. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(1)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
8 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime
9 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days
10 of employment.

11 17. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay at
12 the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES routinely earned
13 non-discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay. However, when
14 sick pay was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED
15 EMPLOYEES, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as required under Cal. Lab.
16 Code Section 246.

17 18. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and
18 the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time
19 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFFS were informed and
20 believe and based thereon allege that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful,
21 such that PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose employment has separated
22 are entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

23 19. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and the other
24 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
25 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFFS and the
26 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to perform work as ordered
27 by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal
28 break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the

1 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which
2 these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work.
3 DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid paying
4 penalties to PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFFS and the
5 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional
6 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

7 20. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED
8 EMPLOYEES were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without
9 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first
10 rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)
11 hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts
12 worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third
13 rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
14 time to time. PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided
15 with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order
16 requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California
17 Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved from all work related
18 duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under
19 California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that
20 employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees
21 spend their time which includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest
22 period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk -
23 five minutes out, five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFFS and
24 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and was unlawful based on
25 DEFENDANT's rule which stated PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES could
26 not leave the work premises during their rest period. As a result of PLAINTIFFS being required
27 to be present on the premises, they were from time to time required by DEFENDANT to work
28 during what should of been their off duty rest period.

1 21. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay
2 PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these
3 employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
4 DEFENDANT is required to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for
5 all time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an
6 employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work.
7 DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the
8 time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS worked through their
9 various meal and rest breaks as they were often interrupted by clients and their immediate needs.
10 This work also was done off-the-clock. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that
11 PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were under compensated for all time
12 worked. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited time
13 worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at
14 the applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off
15 the clock did not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT failed to pay minimum
16 wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and
17 1197.1.

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

28 23. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED

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

9 24. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the
10 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which
11 failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code
12 § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an
13 accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages
14 earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
15 amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED
16 EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all
17 applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable
18 pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section
19 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFFS and the other
20 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information in violation of Cal. Lab.
21 Code Section 226(a)(2). More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the
22 accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements
23 were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period.
24 Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to
25 PLAINTIFFS an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California
26 Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFFS
27 and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab.
28 Code § 226.

1 25. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer
2 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer
3 to said employee." DEFENDANT fails to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFFS and
4 the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, makes unlawful deductions from compensation
5 payable to PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, fails to disclose all
6 aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFFS and the other
7 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and thereby fails to pay these employees all wages due at
8 each applicable pay period and upon termination.

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

16 27. DEFENDANT issued wages to PLAINTIFFS, and the AGGRIEVED
17 EMPLOYEES, by way of a pay card upon termination. This form of payment required
18 PLAINTIFFS, and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, to incur a fee when attempting to
19 obtain all of their wages on demand, no alternative was offered which enabled them to avoid
20 a charge, and no address in California was set forth on the paycard where all of the funds
21 deposited thereon could be made available without charge. Because DEFENDANT offered
22 no method by which PLAINTIFFS, and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, could
23 receive all the wages from their paycard on demand, without paying any fee, it is alleged that
24 this practice violates Labor Code §§ 212, requiring that wages be payable on demand,
25 without discount. Labor Code §§ 225.5 provides penalties resulting from Labor Code §§ 212
26 violations. As a result of DEFENDANT'S failure to pay PLAINTIFFS, and the other
27 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, their wages by an instrument payable on demand, without
28 discount, in violation of Labor Code §§ 212, PLAINTIFFS, and the other AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES, have suffered injury to the extent they paid ATM fees or other fees and
2 could not cash the entirety of their paycheck at once, thus denying them access to their
3 wages.

4 28. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
5 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT
6 intentionally and knowingly failed to compensate PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED
7 EMPLOYEES for missed meal and rest periods. This policy and practice of DEFENDANT
8 is intended to purposefully avoid the payment for all time worked as required by California
9 law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over
10 competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll
11 claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against DEFENDANT, the PAGA PERIOD
12 should be adjusted accordingly.

13 29. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFFS and all AGGRIEVED
14 EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT engaged in a company-wide policy and procedure which
15 failed to accurately calculate and record all missed meal and rest periods by PLAINTIFFS
16 and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. The proper recording of these employees'
17 missed meal and rest breaks is the DEFENDANT's burden. As a result of DEFENDANT's
18 intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT failed to properly
19 calculate and/or pay all required compensation for work performed by the AGGRIEVED
20 EMPLOYEES and violated the California Labor Code and regulations promulgated
21 thereunder as herein alleged.

22 30. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA
23 PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect
24 PLAINTIFFS during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS seek penalties for those violations
25 that affected other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*
26 2018 AJDAR 12157 (Certified for Publication 12/19/18).

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

31. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10.

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act
[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*]
(By PLAINTIFFS and Against All Defendants)

33. PLAINTIFFS reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

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

35. PLAINTIFFS, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private

1 Attorney General Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
2 with respect to themselves and all individuals who are or previously were employed by
3 DEFENDANT in California and who were classified as non-exempt employees
4 (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of October 14, 2020 until a date as
5 determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

6 36. On October 14, 2021, PLAINTIFFS gave written notice by electronic mail to
7 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
8 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
9 Labor Code § 2699.3. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFFS to add these
10 allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3,
11 PLAINTIFFS may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to
12 Section 2699 as the proxies of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED
13 EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

14 37. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
15 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the
16 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly
17 record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,
18 (d) failed to pay overtime and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for required
19 expenses, and (f) failed to pay wages when due, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code
20 sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 212, 221, 226(a), 226.7,
21 227.3, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of
22 Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage
23 Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct.¹ PLAINTIFFS
24 hereby seek recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private
25 Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representatives of the State of California for the illegal
26 conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

27
28 ¹Plaintiffs specifically exclude and/or do not allege any claims under California Labor
Code §558(a)(3).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS pray for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

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

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

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

Dated: March 25, 2022

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: /s/ Nicholas De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw

Attorneys for Plaintiffs