

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
 SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
 SIMONE RUDOLF-DIB (SBN 341186)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
 Pasadena, California 91103
 Telephone: (818) 230-7502
 Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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

SANTANNA FRANKLIN and JOSE
 COJULUN, individually, and on behalf of
 other members of the general public similarly
 situated, and on behalf of aggrieved
 employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys
 General Act (“PAGA”);

Plaintiffs,

v.

MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT,
 LLC, a South Dakota limited liability
 company; RESEDA DISCOUNT
 CORPORATION, a California corporation;
 RABBITSWAG INC. DBA PLUG PLAY, a
 California corporation; and DOES 1 through
 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: **22STCV06205**

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
 DAMAGES**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 (Unpaid Minimum Wages);
- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
- (7) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);
- (8) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (Private Attorneys General Act of 2004);
- (9) Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COME NOW, Plaintiffs SANTANNA FRANKLIN and JOSE COJULUN (“Plaintiffs”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, allege as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiffs exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiffs took place in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiffs within the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiffs SANTANNA FRANKLIN and JOSE COJULUN are individuals residing in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

///

///

///

1 6. Defendant MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC, at all times herein
2 mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a South Dakota limited liability company
3 headquartered in the State of South Dakota, and at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an
4 employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the
5 County of Los Angeles. Defendants RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION and
6 RABBITSWAG, INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, at all times herein mentioned, were and are, upon
7 information and belief, California corporations headquartered in the State of California, and
8 at all times herein mentioned, were and are, employers whose employees are engaged
9 throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

10 7. At all relevant times, Defendant MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC,
11 Defendant RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION, and Defendant RABBITSWAG INC.
12 d/b/a PLUG PLAY were the “employer” of Plaintiffs within the meaning of all applicable
13 California laws and statutes.

14 8. At all times herein relevant, Defendant MELROSE FACILITY
15 MANAGEMENT, LLC, Defendant RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION, and Defendant
16 RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were
17 the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees,
18 successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant
19 hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint
20 venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators
21 and assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification,
22 knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and consent of each defendant
23 designated herein.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs, who sue said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based on that information and belief allege, that each of the Defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiffs and the other class members as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

10. Defendant MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC, Defendant RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION, and Defendant RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

11. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiffs and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

13. The proposed class is defined as follows:

All current and former California-based (i.e. currently residing in California with the intent to remain indefinitely) hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendants within the State of California at any time during the period from August 21, 2017¹ to final judgment.

14. Plaintiffs reserve the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

¹ Per Emergency Rule 9 (Tolling statute of limitations for civil causes of action) of the Judicial Council's Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19, all statute of limitations for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 until October 1, 2020. Accordingly, Plaintiff's claims were tolled during that time period.

1 15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in
2 the litigation:

- 3 a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class
4 members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is
5 unknown to Plaintiffs at this time; however, the class is estimated to be
6 greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is
7 readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.
- 8 b. Typicality: Plaintiffs' claims are typical of all other class members'
9 claims as demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately
10 protect the interests of the other class members with whom he has a well-
11 defined community of interest.
- 12 c. Adequacy: Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of
13 each class member, with whom they have a well-defined community of
14 interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs have
15 no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiffs'
16 attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing
17 class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiffs have
18 incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur,
19 costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily
20 expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of
21 each class member.
- 22 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the
23 fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder
24 of all class members is impractical.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class
2 action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great
3 state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees
4 are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect
5 retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are
6 not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of
7 their rights.

8 16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that
9 predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common
10 questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

- 11 a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or
12 reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- 13 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt
14 employees within the State of California for all hours worked, missed
15 meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- 16 c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiffs and the other class members to
17 work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week
18 and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiffs
19 and the other class members;
- 20 d. Whether Defendants properly calculated the regular rate for Plaintiffs
21 and the other class members to worked overtime and earned incentive
22 pay;
- 23 e. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiffs and the other class members of
24 meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiffs and the other class
25 members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- 26 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the
27 other class members for all hours worked;

28 ///

- 1 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other
2 class members within the required time upon their discharge or
3 resignation;
- 4 h. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and
5 the other class members during their employment;
- 6 i. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the
7 California Labor Code, including, inter alia, section 226;
- 8 j. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class
9 members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- 10 k. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- 11 l. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
12 California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 13 m. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary
14 penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- 15 n. Whether Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to
16 compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

17 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

18 17. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiffs
19 and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

20 18. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiffs as hourly-paid non-
21 exempt employees during the relevant statutory period in the State of California, County of
22 Los Angeles.

23 19. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiffs and the other class
24 members; to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiffs' and other class members'
25 employment; and to supervise their daily employment activities.

26 20. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
27 Plaintiffs and other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiffs
28 and the other class members.

1 21. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiffs and the other
2 class members.

3 22. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the
4 State of California.

5 23. Plaintiffs and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day,
6 and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

7 24. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
8 engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid
9 or non-exempt employees within the State of California. This scheme involved, inter alia,
10 failing to pay them for all hours worked, missed meal periods, and missed rest breaks in
11 violation of California law.

12 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
13 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
14 certain wages for overtime compensation and that Plaintiffs and the other class members were
15 not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

16 26. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
17 failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other class members the required rest and meal periods
18 during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
19 Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

20 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
21 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
22 all timely and complete meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs'
23 and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, late or
24 interrupted, and that Plaintiffs and the other class members did not receive all timely and
25 proper meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when
26 a meal period was missed.

27 ///

28 ///

1 28. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and other class members were entitled to receive
3 all timely rest periods without interruption or payment of one additional hour of pay at
4 Plaintiffs' and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed,
5 late or interrupted, and that Plaintiffs and the other class members did not receive all rest
6 periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period
7 was missed.

8 29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
9 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
10 at least minimum wages for compensation and that Plaintiffs and the other class members were
11 not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

12 30. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
13 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
14 the wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum
15 wages and meal and rest period premiums, and that Plaintiffs and the other class members did
16 not, in fact, receive such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

17 31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
18 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
19 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact,
20 Plaintiffs and the other class members did not receive complete and accurate wage statements
21 from Defendants. The deficiencies included, inter alia, the failure to include the total number
22 of hours worked by Plaintiffs and the other class members.

23 32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
24 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to
25 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records
3 for Plaintiffs and the other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did
4 not keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs and the other class members.

5 34. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
6 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiffs and the other class
7 members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
8 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely
9 represented to Plaintiffs and the other class members that they were properly denied wages,
10 all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

11 35. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
12 overtime wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members for all hours worked. Plaintiffs and
13 other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40)
14 hours per week without overtime compensation.

15 36. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide the
16 requisite uninterrupted and timely meal and rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class
17 members.

18 37. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
19 Plaintiffs and the other class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

20 38. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
21 Plaintiffs and the other class members the wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

22 39. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide
23 complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs and the other class members.

24 40. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to keep
25 complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs and the other class members.

26 41. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to properly
27 compensate Plaintiffs and the other class members pursuant to California law in order to
28 increase Defendants' profits.

1 42. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor
2 Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to “sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty
3 due to him [or her] under this article.”

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**

6 **(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT**
7 **CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY; and DOES 1 through**
8 **100)**

9 43. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1
10 through 42, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
11 forth herein.

12 44. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare
13 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without
14 compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular
15 rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly
16 basis.

17 45. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and
18 were required to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members employed by Defendants, who
19 work(ed) more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at
20 the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more
21 than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

22 46. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were
23 required to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members overtime compensation at a rate of two
24 times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

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

48. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

49. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiffs and the other class members.

50. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

51. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))

(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100)

52. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 51, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

53. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiffs' and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

///

1 54. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
2 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest
3 period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

4 55. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
5 and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or
6 permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without
7 providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if
8 the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period
9 may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

10 56. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
11 and California Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require,
12 cause, or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day
13 without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty
14 (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the
15 second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only
16 if the first meal period was not waived.

17 57. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class
18 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and
19 who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to
20 work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less
21 than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

22 58. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class
23 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than twelve (12) hours,
24 and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required
25 to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less
26 than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

27 ///

28 ///

59. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

60. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of twelve (12) hours were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

61. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiffs and the other class members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other class members the full meal period premium for work performed during meal periods.

62. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

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

64. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest period is not provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)

(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100)

65. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 64, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

1 66. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
2 and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiffs' and the other class
3 members' employment by Defendants.

4 67. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
5 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period
6 mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

7 68. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
8 provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods,
9 which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest
10 period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net
11 rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily work time is less
12 than three and one-half (3 ½) hours.

13 69. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants required Plaintiffs
14 and the other class members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting
15 a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

16 70. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants willfully required
17 Plaintiffs and the other class members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiffs
18 and the other class members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest
19 periods.

20 71. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
21 Plaintiffs and the other class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California
22 Labor Code section 226.7.

23 72. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor
24 Code section 226.7.

25 73. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section
26 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
27 additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday
28 that the rest period was not provided.

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197)**

3 **(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT**
4 **CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100)**

5 74. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
6 through 73 and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
7 forth herein.

8 75. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections
9 1194 and 1197 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of
10 a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed, is unlawful.

11 76. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
12 minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members as required, pursuant to California
13 Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197.

14 77. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the minimum
15 wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197. Pursuant to those
16 sections, Plaintiffs and other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their
17 minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorney's fees, and liquidated
18 damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

19 78. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiffs and the other class
20 members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages
21 unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

22 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202)**

24 **(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT**
25 **CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100)**

26 79. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
27 through 78, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
28 forth herein.

1 80. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections
2 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid
3 at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her
4 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72)
5 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her
6 intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of
7 quitting.

8 81. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and
9 willfully failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members who are no longer employed by
10 Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving
11 Defendants' employ.

12 82. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members who are no
13 longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours
14 of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and
15 202.

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

20 84. Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants
21 the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to the thirty (30) day maximum
22 as provided by Labor Code section 203.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))**

3 **(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT**
4 **CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100)**

5 85. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
6 through 84, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
7 forth herein.

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

22 87. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the
23 other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include
24 but are not limited to: the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiffs and
25 other class members.

26 88. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a),
27 Plaintiffs and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily
28 protected rights.

89. More specifically, Plaintiffs and the other class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

90. Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

91. Plaintiffs and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)

(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100)

92. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 91, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

94. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

///

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

3 **(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT**
4 **CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100)**

5 95. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
6 through 94, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
7 forth herein.

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

13 97. On December 8, 2021, Plaintiff Santanna Franklin provided written notice to the
14 LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code she contends were violated,
15 and the theories supporting her contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by
16 reference is a copy of the December 8, 2021, written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff Franklin
17 believes that on or about February 11, 2022, the sixty-five (65) day notice period expired as to
18 all Defendants, and the LWDA did not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter.
19 Therefore, Plaintiff Franklin exhausted the statutory time period to bring this action.

20 98. On December 9, 2021, Plaintiff Jose Cojulun provided written notice to the
21 LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code he contends were violated,
22 and the theories supporting his contentions. Included in **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by reference
23 is a copy of the December 9, 2021, written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff Cojulun believes that
24 on or about February 14, 2022, the sixty-five (65) day notice period expired as to all Defendants,
25 and the LWDA did not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore,
26 Plaintiff Cojulun exhausted the statutory time period to bring this action.

27 ///

28 ///

1 99. Plaintiffs and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are “aggrieved
2 employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all current and former
3 California-based (i.e. currently residing in California with the intent to remain indefinitely)
4 hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendants within the State of California who worked
5 for Defendants at any time during the period from December 8, 2020, to the present, and one or
6 more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

7 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

8 100. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their non-
9 exempt employees minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all hours
10 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, pursuant to the
11 mandate of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

12 101. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other
13 aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay all
14 minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

15 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

16 102. In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, Defendants
17 were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a 10-minute rest break
18 for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, and were further required to provide
19 their non-exempt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five (5) hours worked.

20 103. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other
21 aggrieved current and former employees with legally-mandated meal periods and rest breaks
22 and failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

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

24 104. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees
25 within a specified time period pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code § 204.

26 105. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other
27 aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required time
28 period.

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

2 106. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees all
3 wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to California Labor Code §§
4 201 to 204.

5 107. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants failed
6 to pay Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages pursuant to Labor
7 Code §§ 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

8 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

9 108. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep *accurate* records
10 regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§ 226, 1174 and
11 1776.

12 109. As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants failed to
13 keep accurate records regarding Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved current and former
14 employees. For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate
15 records regarding Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved current and former employees' gross wages
16 earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates and
17 the number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

18 **Failure to Provide Paid Sick Days**

19 110. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to provide their employees
20 with paid sick days pursuant to Labor Code § 246.

21 111. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other
22 aggrieved current and former employees with paid sick days pursuant to Labor Code § 246.

23 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

24 112. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its employees
25 for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct
26 consequences of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§
27 2800 and 2802.

28 ///

113. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved current and former employees for all business expenses incurred and owing them within the required time period.

Penalties

114. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of the other current and former aggrieved employees, request and are entitled to recover from Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs, including but not limited to:

- a. Penalties under California Labor Code § 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 § 11040 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- c. Penalties under California Labor Code § 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- d. Penalties under Labor Code § 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- e. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes; and

f. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

(Against MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION; RABBITSWAG INC. d/b/a PLUG PLAY, and DOES 1 through 100)

115. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 114, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

116. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiffs, the other class members, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

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

118. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Plaintiffs and the other class members work overtime hours without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Plaintiffs and the other class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policy and practice of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members violate California Labor Code sections 201 and 202. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1194, 1197, 2800 and 2802.

119. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

120. Plaintiffs and the other class members have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

121. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this Complaint; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, request a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, pray for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as representatives of the Class;
3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel; and
4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

As to the First Cause of Action

5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiffs and the other class members;

6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

///

1 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
2 from the date such amounts were due;

3 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
4 California Labor Code section 1194; and

5 9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

6 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

7 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
8 Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to
9 provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiffs and the other class
10 members;

11 11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiffs and the other class members of one
12 (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal
13 period was not provided;

14 12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
15 proof;

16 13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);

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

19 15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

20 16. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

21 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

22 17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
23 Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all
24 rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class members;

25 18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiffs and the other class members of one
26 (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest
27 period was not provided;

28 ///

1 19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
2 proof;

3 20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);

4 21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
5 due; and

6 22. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

7 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

8 23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
9 Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs
10 and the other class members;

11 24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be
12 appropriate;

13 25. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
14 amounts were due;

15 26. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
16 California Labor Code section 1194(a);

17 27. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

18 28. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

19 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

20 29. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
21 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at
22 the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiffs and the other class members no longer
23 employed by Defendants;

24 30. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
25 proof;

26 31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for
27 the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

28 ///

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

33. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

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

36. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g); and

38. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

39. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

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

41. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

42. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

44. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

45. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the PAGA, for civil penalties pursuant to Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802;

1 46. Upon the Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code
2 Sections 210, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute; and

3 47. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

4 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action**

5 48. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
6 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiffs and the
7 other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and
8 rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages
9 to Plaintiffs and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiffs' and the other class
10 members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202.

11 49. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members and all
12 pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

13 50. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
14 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
15 Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections
16 17200, *et seq.*;

17 51. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
18 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

19 52. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to
20 California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

21 53. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

22
23 Dated: February 18, 2022

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

24
25
26 By: 

Douglas Han
Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh
Simone Rudolf-Dib
Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

December 8, 2021

BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

State of California

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, California 95814

Re: MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC, RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION, AND RABBITSWAG INC d/b/a PLUG PLAY

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Santanna Franklin against Melrose Facility Management, LLC, Reseda Discount Corporation, and Rabbitswag Inc. d/b/a Plug Play (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "RABBITSWAG").

Ms. Franklin is pursuing her California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Ms. Franklin may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Melrose Facility Management, LLC is a South Dakota limited liability company located at 7027 Eton Ave., Canoga Park, California 91303. Reseda Discount Corporation is a California corporation located at 18448 Oxnard Street, Oxnard, California 91356. Rabbitswag Inc. d/b/a Plug Play is a California corporation located at 9419 Mason Ave., Ste. A, Chatsworth, California 91311.

///

///

¹ Ms. Franklin does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Ms. Franklin will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Ms. Franklin is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Ms. Franklin and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

RABBITSWAG employed Ms. Franklin as an hourly-paid non-exempt Warehouse Associate within one year of the date of this letter (until in or around July of 2021²) in the State of California. RABBITSWAG directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" that Ms. Franklin may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of RABBITSWAG within the State of California.

RABBITSWAG failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Ms. Franklin has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at RABBITSWAG, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

RABBITSWAG has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

///

///

///

² Per Emergency Rule 9 (Tolling statute of limitations for civil causes of action) of the Judicial Council's Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19, all statute of limitations for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 until October 1, 2020. Therefore, the one (1) year statute of limitations for Ms. Franklin's PAGA cause of action is tolled.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, pay time-and-a-half, or double-time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. RABBITSWAG failed to compensate Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, undergoing COVID-19 screenings, waiting in line to clock-in, and during meal breaks. RABBITSWAG also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and incentives in Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG failed to pay Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees with paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG routinely required Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with RABBITSWAG's policies and expectations, and meet production quotas. RABBITSWAG also failed to provide adequate coverage to Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Moreover, RABBITSWAG also failed to authorize and permit Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, RABBITSWAG failed to compensate Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

LWDA

December 8, 2021

Page 4 of 7

California Labor Code section 551 states “[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day’s rest therefrom in seven.” Section 552 further states “[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven.” RABBITSWAG required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day’s rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states “[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law.” RABBITSWAG required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG failed to pay Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG failed to pay Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG did not provide Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from RABBITSWAG were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only 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 Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than two years. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG did not provide Ms. Franklin and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, undergoing COVID-19 screenings, waiting in line to clock-in, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by RABBITSWAG, including for purchasing equipment they were required to wear while working and using their personal cellular phones for work purposes.

We believe that Ms. Franklin and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in questions and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

///

///

///

LWDA

December 8, 2021

Page 7 of 7

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Ms. Franklin will seek these penalties on her own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of RABBITSWAG within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

John Lee
c/o Melrose Facility Management, LLC
7027 Eton Ave.
Canoga Park, California 91303
Agent for Service of Process for Melrose Facility Management, LLC

Abraham Finberg and Associates Inc.
c/o Reseda Discount Corporation
8383 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 800
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Agent for Service of Process for Reseda Discount Corporation

Tommy SF Wang
c/o Rabbitswag Inc. d/b/a Plug Play
18645 E. Gale Ave., #205
City of Industry, CA 91748
Agent for Service of Process for Rabbitswag Inc. d/b/a Plug Play

December 9, 2021

BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

State of California

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, California 95814

Re: MELROSE FACILITY MANAGEMENT, LLC, RESEDA DISCOUNT CORPORATION, AND RABBITSWAG INC d/b/a PLUG PLAY

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Jose Cojulun against Melrose Facility Management, LLC, Reseda Discount Corporation, and Rabbitswag Inc. d/b/a Plug Play (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "RABBITSWAG").

Mr. Cojulun is pursuing his California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Cojulun may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Melrose Facility Management, LLC is a South Dakota limited liability company located at 7027 Eton Ave., Canoga Park, California 91303. Reseda Discount Corporation is a California corporation located at 18448 Oxnard Street, Oxnard, California 91356. Rabbitswag Inc. d/b/a Plug Play is a California corporation located at 9419 Mason Ave., Ste. A, Chatsworth, California 91311.

///

///

¹ Mr. Cojulun does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Cojulun will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Cojulun is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Cojulun and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

RABBITSWAG employed Mr. Cojulun as an hourly-paid non-exempt Production Associate within one year of the date of this letter (until in or around September of 2021²) in the State of California. RABBITSWAG directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Cojulun may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of RABBITSWAG within the State of California.

RABBITSWAG failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Cojulun has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at RABBITSWAG, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

RABBITSWAG has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

///

///

///

² Per Emergency Rule 9 (Tolling statute of limitations for civil causes of action) of the Judicial Council's Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19, all statute of limitations for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 until October 1, 2020. Therefore, the one (1) year statute of limitations for Mr. Cojulun's PAGA cause of action is tolled.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, pay time-and-a-half, or double-time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. RABBITSWAG failed to compensate Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, undergoing COVID-19 screenings, waiting in line to clock-in, and during meal breaks. RABBITSWAG also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and incentives in Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG failed to pay Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees with paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG routinely required Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with RABBITSWAG's policies and expectations, and meet production quotas. RABBITSWAG also failed to provide adequate coverage to Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Moreover, RABBITSWAG also failed to authorize and permit Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, RABBITSWAG failed to compensate Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states “[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day’s rest therefrom in seven.” Section 552 further states “[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven.” RABBITSWAG required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day’s rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states “[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law.” RABBITSWAG required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG failed to pay Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG failed to pay Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG did not provide Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from RABBITSWAG were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only 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 Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than two years. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, RABBITSWAG did not provide Mr. Cojulun and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, undergoing COVID-19 screenings, waiting in line to clock-in, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by RABBITSWAG, including for purchasing equipment they were required to wear while working and using their personal cellular phones for work purposes.

We believe that Mr. Cojulun and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in questions and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

///

///

///

LWDA

December 9, 2021

Page 7 of 7

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Cojulun will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of RABBITSWAG within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

John Lee
c/o Melrose Facility Management, LLC
7027 Eton Ave.
Canoga Park, California 91303
Agent for Service of Process for Melrose Facility Management, LLC

Abraham Finberg and Associates Inc.
c/o Reseda Discount Corporation
8383 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 800
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Agent for Service of Process for Reseda Discount Corporation

Tommy SF Wang
c/o Rabbitswag Inc. d/b/a Plug Play
18645 E. Gale Ave., #205
City of Industry, CA 91748
Agent for Service of Process for Rabbitswag Inc. d/b/a Plug Play

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

On December 11, 2025, I served the foregoing document described as