



AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC
9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: 949.379.6250
Facsimile: 949.379.6251
www.aegislawfirm.com

February 3, 2025

VIA E-MAIL

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL (RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED)

Agent for Service of Process for Frisco Baking Company, Inc.:
Aldo Pricco Jr.
621 Wave 26
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Attorneys of Record for Defendant Frisco Baking Company, Inc.:
GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP
JOSHUA WAGNER,
SHIAO-WEN HUANG
633 W. Fifth Street, 52nd Floor

Re: Cesar Galicia v. Frisco Baking Company, Inc.

Dear Labor and Workforce Development Agency; Frisco Baking Company, Inc.:

Please allow this correspondence to serve as written notice required by California Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1) of the specific provisions of the Labor Code allegedly violated by Frisco Baking Company, Inc. and Damon Perata ("Frisco" or "Defendants") and the facts and theories in support of said allegations. This firm represents Cesar Galicia ("Claimant"); we hereby notify you that Claimant intends to seek penalties against Frisco under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*, on Claimant's own behalf and all other aggrieved employees. We write to amend our prior letter on behalf of Claimant to add additional factual support for Claimant's existing claims, to notify of Claimant's intent to add Damon Perata as an additional employer and named Defendant, to add additional theories of liability under § 1198, and to add additional claims for violations of Labor Code § 558.1.

Specific Provisions of the Labor Code Allegedly Violated by Frisco

The specific provisions of the Labor Code allegedly violated by Frisco and the provisions under which Claimant submits this correspondence include the following: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802.

Facts and Theories Supporting the Allegations Against Frisco

Claimant and other aggrieved employees worked for Frisco in California as non-exempt employees. Claimant was employed by Frisco in California within the past year.

During the liability period, Frisco failed to provide 30-minute uninterrupted meal periods within the appropriate time intervals to Claimant and other aggrieved employees as required by Labor Code section 512 and section 11 of the applicable Wage Order. Claimant and other aggrieved employees frequently worked shifts over five hours and did not receive lawful meal periods because they were interrupted during their meal periods, were required to work through their meal periods, were required to remain on-duty during meal periods, were not provided second or third meal periods, were subject to meal period rounding or automatic deduction, and/or were not scheduled to be relieved at the appropriate intervals to receive all lawful meal periods. As a result, their meal periods were missed, late, short, and/or interrupted.

When Claimant and other aggrieved employees missed meal periods or if the meal periods were late, short, and/or interrupted, Frisco violated Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, as well as section 11 of the applicable Wage Order, by failing to pay an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of pay to Claimant and other aggrieved employees for every day in which they suffered a meal period violation. Even if Frisco paid some meal period premiums, it failed to include incentive pay or commissions in the meal period premium rate, thereby underpaying those premiums.

Frisco failed to authorize or permit paid 10-minute rest periods for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked because Claimant and other aggrieved employees were required to work through their rest periods, were required to remain on-duty during rest periods, were interrupted during rest periods, were discouraged from taking their rest periods, and/or were not scheduled to be relieved at the appropriate intervals to receive all rest periods.

When Claimant and other aggrieved employees did not receive rest periods, Frisco violated Labor Code section 226.7 and section 12 of the applicable Wage Order by failing to pay an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of pay to Claimant and other aggrieved employees. Even if Frisco paid some rest period premiums, it failed to include incentive pay or commissions in the rest period premium rate, thereby underpaying those premiums.

Frisco failed to pay Claimant and other aggrieved employees at least the legal minimum wage and overtime wage for all hours worked (in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198) due to Frisco's policy and practice of requiring Claimant and aggrieved employees to work off-the-clock. For example, Frisco rounding time punches, automatically deducted meal periods not taken, and required Claimant and other aggrieved employees to work during meal periods among other off-the-clock duties. To the extent such work performed off-the-clock entitled employees to pay at the legal minimum wage rate or at the overtime rate of pay, Frisco failed to pay Claimant and other aggrieved all minimum and overtime wages for these hours. Furthermore, Frisco failed to pay double time hours at the double

time rate and miscalculated overtime and double time by failing to include commissions or other incentive pay in the overtime pay, thereby underpaying Claimant and other aggrieved employees.

Claimant and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses as a direct consequence of the discharge of their job duties for the benefit of Frisco. For example, Claimant and aggrieved employees incurred expenses associated with using their personal cell phones for client calls as required for work, among other expenses. As such, Frisco violated Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 by failing to reimburse Claimant and other aggrieved employees for such expenses.

As a result of, and in addition to, these actions, Frisco violated Labor Code sections 226, and 226.3 by failing to provide itemized wage statements that accurately reported the following: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Specifically, the wage statements failed to list the correct hours, rates, and pay due to the above unpaid wage violations; among other violations.

Frisco violated Labor Code sections 1174 and 1174.5 by failing to maintain accurate and complete records showing the hours worked daily by the aggrieved employees and the wages paid to aggrieved employees (due to the same underpayment of wages referenced above).

Furthermore, Frisco violated the Labor Code by failing to properly pay all these wages owed throughout aggrieved employees' employment and following the end of these workers' employment with Frisco due to the above violations (in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204).

Defendants also failed to provide Claimant and other aggrieved employees with reasonable comfort within their work environment by failing to maintain the indoor temperature within the range of industry standards by, and failing to provide adequate cooling and/or ventilation within the workplace, in violation of Labor Code section 1198. At times during the relevant time period, Claimant and other current and former aggrieved employees placed at Frisco's Los Angeles, California facility were routinely subjected to excessive heat and/or humidity resulting in temperatures equaling or exceeding 82° F. Moreover, Claimant alleges that Defendants failed to take necessary measures to provide a comfortable work environment to Claimant and other aggrieved employees, such as the use of effective cooling and ventilation systems. Labor Code § 1198 requires an employer to comply with the standard conditions of labor for California employees as set forth by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"). Section 15 of the IWC Wage Order states:

(A) The temperature maintained in each work area shall provide reasonable comfort consistent with industry-wide standards for the nature of the process and the work performed.;

(B) If excessive heat or humidity is created by the work process, the employer shall take all feasible means to reduce such excessive heat or humidity to a degree providing reasonable comfort. Where the nature of the employment requires a temperature of less than 60° F., a heated room shall be provided to which employees may retire for warmth, and such room shall be maintained at not less than 68°.;

(C) A temperature of not less than 68° shall be maintained in the toilet rooms, resting rooms, and change rooms during hours of use.;

(D) Federal and State energy guidelines shall prevail over any conflicting provision of this section.

(See e.g., Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11070(15), Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11090(15).) California law requires an employer to endeavor to provide a safe and healthy workplace. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3203.) Further, Labor Code section 6720 required the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health ("CaUOSHA") to propose an indoor heat illness standard by January 1, 2019. (Lab. Code, § 6720.) Cal/OSHA's draft standard applies its proposed regulations to "all indoor work areas where the temperature equals or exceeds 82 degrees Fahrenheit when employees are present." For these reasons, at times during the one year prior to the filing of Claimant's initial letter in violation of Labor Code section 1198 and Section 15 of the IWC Wage Orders, Defendants failed to provide Claimant and other aggrieved employees with reasonable comfort by maintaining the indoor temperature within the range of industry standards by, *inter alia*, providing adequate cooling and/or ventilation.

Based on these violations, Claimant seeks attorneys' fees, interest, and penalties under the Labor Code. Claimant has already filed in the Superior Court, on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees against Defendant Frisco Baking Company, Inc. Attached hereto and incorporated herein is the operative First Amended Complaint. The case is currently pending in the Los Angeles County Superior Court and is entitled *Galicia v. Frisco Baking Company, Inc.* (Case No. 22STCV02566). Claimant intends to amend the complaint to include additional theories of liability for violations of Labor Code § 1198, and to add the additional claims for violations of Labor Code § 558.1, and Damon Perata as additional named Defendant, after the minimum required review period elapses.

Thank you for your assistance on this matter. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,
AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

Alexander G.L. Davies
Alexander G.L. Davies

Enclosure: First Amended Class Action Complaint

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104
 KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672
 JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 280626
 ALEXANDER G.L. Davies, State Bar No. 328125
 9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
 Irvine, California 92618
 Telephone: (949) 379-6250
 Facsimile: (949) 379-6251
 Email: jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com
 adavies@aegislawfirm.com

Attorneys for Cesar Galicia, individually,
 and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

05/27/2022

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: M. Arellanes Deputy

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

CESAR GALICIA, individually and on
 behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FRISCO BAKING COMPANY, INC.; and
 DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 22STCV02566

Assigned For All Purposes To:
Hon. Elihu M. Berle
Department SS6

**[Amended as a matter of right, pursuant to
 Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(2)(C)]**

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
 COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
4. Failure to Permit Rest Breaks;
5. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
7. Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Separation of Employment;
8. Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and
9. Enforcement of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* ("PAGA")

1 Plaintiff Cesar Galicia, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, alleges as
2 follows:

3 **NATURE OF ACTION AND INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff Cesar Galicia (“Plaintiff”) brings this putative class action and
5 representative action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code. §
6 2698 *et seq.*, against defendant Frisco Baking Company, Inc.; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive
7 (“Defendant”), on Plaintiff’s own behalf and on behalf of California citizens who are and were
8 employed by Defendant as non-exempt employees throughout California.

9 2. Defendant is in the restaurant industry.

10 3. Through this action, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant engaged in a systematic
11 pattern of wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare
12 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders, all of which contribute to Defendant’s deliberate unfair
13 competition.

14 4. Plaintiff is informed and believe, and thereon alleges, that Defendant has
15 increased their profits by violating state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 16 (a) failing to pay all wages (including minimum wages and overtime wages);
- 17 (b) failing to provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- 18 (c) failing to authorize or permit lawful rest breaks or provide compensation
19 in lieu thereof;
- 20 (d) failing to reimburse necessary business-related costs;
- 21 (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- 22 (f) failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.

23 5. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendant on behalf of himself and all
24 others similarly situated in California to recover, among other things, unpaid wages, un-
25 reimbursed business expenses, benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, and
26 penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558,
27 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and 2698, *et seq.*, and
28 Code of California Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This is a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

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

8. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendant because, upon information and belief, it is a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself 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.

9. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendant resides, transacts business, or has offices in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county.

THE PARTIES

10. Plaintiff is a citizen of California and worked for Defendant during the relevant time periods as alleged herein.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant was and is subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders as employers, whose employees were and are engaged throughout this county and the State of California.

12. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the defendant sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 20, but will seek leave of this Court to amend this Complaint and serve such fictitiously named defendants once their names and capacities become known.

1 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 20
2 are or were the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers, or employees of Defendant at
3 all relevant times.

4 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant acted
5 in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendant, carried out a joint
6 scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant
7 are legally attributable to the other defendant. Furthermore, defendant in all respects acted as the
8 employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the class members.

9 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts
10 and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendant and/or DOES
11 1 through 20, acting as the agent or alter ego for the other, with legal authority to act on the
12 other's behalf. The acts of any and all Defendant were in accordance with, and represent, the
13 official policy of Defendant.

14 16. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the scope of
15 such agency or employment, or ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At
16 all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of
17 each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

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

21 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

22 18. Plaintiff brings this action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on Plaintiff's own
23 behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated who were affected by Defendant's Labor
24 Code, Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, and IWC Wage Order violations.

25 19. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks
26 relief authorized by California law.

27 20. Plaintiff's proposed class consists of and is defined as follows:
28

1 Class

2 All California citizens currently or formerly employed by Defendant as non-
3 exempt employees in the State of California at any time between July 27, 2017¹
4 and the date of class certification (“Class”).

5 21. Plaintiff also seeks to certify the following subclasses of employees:

6 Waiting Time Subclass

7 All members of the Class who separated their employment with Defendant at any
8 time between July 27, 2018 and the date of class certification (“Waiting Time
9 Subclass”).

10 22. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify or re-define the Class, establish additional
11 subclasses, or modify or re-define any class or subclass definition as appropriate based on
12 investigation, discovery, and specific theories of liability.

13 23. Members of the Class and the Waiting Time Subclass described above will be
14 collectively referred to as “Class Members.”

15 24. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class Members that
16 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members including, but not limited to,
17 the following:

18 (a) Whether Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages
19 (including minimum wages and overtime wages) for all hours worked by
20 Plaintiff and Class Members.

21 (b) Whether Defendant required Plaintiff and Class Members to work over
22 eight (8) hours per day, over twelve (12) hours per day, and/or over forty
23 (40) hours per week and failed to pay them proper overtime compensation
24 for all overtime hours worked.

25
26
27 ¹ The statute of limitations for this matter was tolled between April 6, 2020 and October 1, 2020
28 pursuant to Cal. Rules of Court, Appendix I, Emergency Rule No. 9.

- 1 (c) Whether Defendant deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of timely meal
2 periods or required Plaintiff and Class Members to work through meal
3 periods without compensation at the regular rate of pay.
- 4 (d) Whether Defendant deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of rest breaks or
5 required Plaintiff and Class Members to work through rest breaks without
6 compensation at the regular rate of pay.
- 7 (e) Whether Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for
8 necessary business-related costs expended for the benefit of Defendant.
- 9 (f) Whether Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members accurate
10 itemized wage statements.
- 11 (g) Whether Defendant failed to timely pay the Waiting Time Subclass all
12 wages due upon termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of
13 resignation.
- 14 (h) Whether Defendant's conduct was willful or reckless.
- 15 (i) Whether Defendant engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
16 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

17 25. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the proposed
18 Class and subclasses are readily ascertainable:

19 (a) Numerosity: The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all
20 members is impractical. Although the members of the Class are unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
21 on information and belief, the Class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals. The
22 identities of the Class Members are readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendant's
23 employment and payroll records.

24 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of the claims
25 (or defenses, if any) of the Class Members because Defendant's failure to comply with the
26 provisions of California's wage and hour laws entitled each Class Member to similar pay,
27 benefits, and other relief. The injuries sustained by Plaintiff are also typical of the injuries
28

1 sustained by the Class Members, because they arise out of and are caused by Defendant's
2 common course of conduct as alleged herein.

3 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the
4 interests of all Class Members because it is in Plaintiff's best interest to prosecute the claims
5 alleged herein to obtain full compensation and penalties due. Plaintiff's attorneys, as proposed
6 class counsel, are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions and
7 versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has
8 incurred and, throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur attorneys' fees and
9 costs that have been and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the
10 substantial benefit of the Class Members.

11 (d) Superiority: The nature of this action makes use of class action
12 adjudication superior to other methods. A class action will achieve economies of time, effort, and
13 expense as compared with separate lawsuits and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the
14 same issues can be adjudicated in the same manner for the entire Class and Waiting Time
15 Subclass at the same time. If appropriate, this Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods
16 to efficiently manage this case as a class action.

17 (e) Public Policy Considerations: Employers in the State of California violate
18 employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights
19 out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions
20 because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through
21 negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide class members who are not named
22 in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights while
23 affording them privacy protections.

24 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

25 26. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendant employed Plaintiff and other
26 California citizens as non-exempt employees throughout California at Defendant's California
27 business location(s).

28 27. Defendant continues to employ non-exempt employees within California.

1 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
2 mentioned, Defendant was advised by skilled lawyers, employees, and other professionals who
3 were knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel
4 practices, and the requirements of California law.

5 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
6 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive wages for all time
7 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages) and that they were not receiving all
8 wages earned for work that was required to be performed. In violation of the Labor Code and
9 IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid all wages (including minimum
10 wages and overtime wages) for all hours worked, including, but not limited to failing to pay
11 overtime at the correct rate including non-discretionary pay, failing to pay double time as
12 required, rounding time punches to the employer's advantage, requiring Plaintiff and Class
13 Members to work off-the-clock, and failing to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for these
14 hours.

15 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
16 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive all required meal
17 periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular
18 rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted meal period. In violation of the
19 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive all meal periods
20 or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate of
21 pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted meal period.

22 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
23 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive all rest breaks or
24 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate of pay
25 when a rest break was late, missed, or interrupted. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage
26 Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive all rest breaks or payment of one (1)
27 additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate of pay when a rest break
28 was missed, late, or interrupted.

1 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
2 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to reimbursement and/or
3 indemnification for all necessary business expenditures or losses as a direct consequence of the
4 discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendant. In violation of the
5 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members incurred necessary business
6 expenses or losses, such as using their personal cell phones as required for work, but were not
7 reimbursed nor indemnified of such expenses or losses that were incurred as a direct
8 consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendant.

9 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
10 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive itemized wage
11 statements that accurately showed the following information pursuant to the Labor Code: (1)
12 gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of piece-rate units
13 earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all
14 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
15 aggregated and shown as one item; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for
16 which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or
17 her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security
18 number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable
19 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at
20 each hourly rate by the employee. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and Class Members
21 were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

22 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
23 should have known that the Waiting Time Subclass was entitled to timely payment of wages due
24 upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, the Waiting Time Subclass did
25 not receive payment of all wages within the permissible time periods.

26 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
27 should have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members, and Defendant
28 had the financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally

1 failed to do so in order to increase Defendant's profits.

2 36. Therefore, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking monetary and injunctive relief
3 against Defendant on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all Class Members to recover,
4 among other things, unpaid wages (including minimum wages and overtime wages), unpaid meal
5 period premium payments, unpaid rest period premium payments, unreimbursed business
6 expenditures, interest, attorneys' fees, penalties, costs, and expenses.

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

9 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; Violation of IWC Wage Order §3-4)

10 37. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
11 though fully set forth herein.

12 38. Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 provide that the minimum wage for employees
13 fixed by the IWC is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser
14 wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

15 39. Plaintiff and Class Members were employees entitled to the protections of Labor
16 Code §§ 1194 and 1197.

17 40. During the relevant time period, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class
18 Members all wages owed when Defendant did not pay for all hours worked.

19 41. During the relevant time period, Defendant failed to pay at least minimum wage
20 to Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197.

21 42. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the required minimum
22 wage violates Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197. Pursuant to these sections, Plaintiff and Class
23 Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as
24 well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

25 43. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
26 recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and the accrued
27 interest thereon.

28 ///

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME**

3 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 3)

4 44. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
5 though fully set forth herein.

6 45. Labor Code § 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that it is
7 unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either one and one-half
8 (1½) or two (2) times the person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours
9 worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

10 46. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Orders provide that Defendant is and was
11 required to pay overtime compensation to Plaintiff and Class Members at the rate of one and
12 one-half times (1½) their regular rate of pay when working and for all hours worked in excess of
13 eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek and for the first eight (8)
14 hours of work on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

15 47. The applicable IWC Wage Orders further provide that Defendant is and was
16 required to pay overtime compensation to Plaintiff and Class Members at a rate of two times
17 their regular rate of pay when working and for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in
18 a day or in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

19 48. California Labor Code § 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one
20 and one-half (1½) times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a
21 day or forty (40) hours in a week and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh
22 consecutive day of work, and overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours
23 worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the
24 seventh day of work in a workweek.

25 49. Labor Code § 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders provide that employment
26 of more than six days in a workweek is only permissible if the employer pays proper overtime
27 compensation as set forth herein.
28

50. Plaintiff and Class Members were employees entitled to the protections of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194.

51. During the relevant time period, Defendant required Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, forty (40) hours in a week, and/or on a seventh consecutive day of work, entitling them to overtime wages.

52. During the relevant time period, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members overtime wages for all overtime hours worked at the correct rate of pay. To the extent these hours qualify for the payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid proper overtime wages. Further, when Defendant paid overtime wages, they were sometimes miscalculated because, among other reasons, Defendant did not include all non-discretionary pay in the calculation.

53. In violation of California law, Defendant knowingly and willfully refused to perform its obligations and compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for all wages earned and all hours worked.

54. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

55. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover their unpaid overtime and double time compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS

(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 11)

56. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

57. Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

1 58. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states, “[n]o employer shall
2 employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not
3 less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will
4 complete the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and
5 the employee.”

6 59. Labor Code § 512(a) provides that an employer may not require, cause, or permit
7 an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the
8 employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if
9 the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may
10 be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

11 60. Labor Code § 512(a) also provides that an employer may not employ an employee
12 for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a
13 second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no
14 more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the
15 employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

16 61. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive
17 compliant meal periods for working more than five (5) and ten (10) hours per day because their
18 meal periods were missed, late, short, interrupted, and/or they were not permitted to take a
19 second meal period.

20 62. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order require
21 an employer to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of
22 compensation for each work day that a compliant meal period is not provided.

23 63. At all relevant times, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members meal
24 period premiums for missed, late, and/or short meal periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b)
25 and section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

26 64. As a result of Defendant’s failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members an
27 additional hour of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided, Plaintiff and
28 Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PERMIT REST BREAKS**

3 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 12)

4 65. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
5 though fully set forth herein.

6 66. Labor Code § 226.7(a) provides that no employer shall require an employee to
7 work during any rest period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

8 67. Section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states “[e]very employer shall
9 authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in
10 the middle of each work period[,]” and the “[a]uthorized rest period time shall be based on the
11 total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major
12 fraction thereof[,]” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

13 68. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive a ten
14 (10) minute rest period for every four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked, including
15 working in excess of ten (10) hours in a day, because they were required to work through their
16 rest periods and/or were not authorized to take their rest periods.

17 69. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order requires
18 an employer to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of
19 compensation for each work day that a compliant rest period is not provided.

20 70. At all relevant times, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members rest
21 period premiums for missed, late, and/or interrupted rest periods pursuant to Labor Code §
22 226.7(b) and section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

23 71. As a result of Defendant’s failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members an
24 additional hour of pay for each day a compliant rest period was not provided, Plaintiff and Class
25 Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

3 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 2800, 2802)

4 72. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
5 though fully set forth herein.

6 73. Labor Code § 2800 states that “[a]n employer shall in all cases indemnify his
7 employee for losses caused by the employer’s want of ordinary care.”

8 74. Labor Code § 2802(a) states that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her
9 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
10 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
11 the employer”

12 75. Labor Code § 2802(b) states that “[a]ll awards made by a court . . . for
13 reimbursement of necessary expenditures under this section shall carry interest at the same rate
14 as judgments in civil actions. Interest shall accrue from the date on which the employee incurred
15 the necessary expenditure or loss.”

16 76. Labor Code § 2802(c) states that “[f]or purposes of this section, the term
17 “necessary expenditures or losses” shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited
18 to, attorney’s fees incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section.”

19 77. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members incurred necessary
20 business-related costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendant.

21 78. In violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802, Defendant failed to reimburse or
22 indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members for their expenses due to Defendant’s knowing and
23 intentional failure to reimburse necessary business expenditures in connection with Plaintiff’s
24 and Class Members’ work and job duties.

25 79. As a direct result, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered and continue to
26 suffer losses, and therefore seek complete reimbursement and indemnification of necessary
27 business expenditures or losses, interest thereon at the required rate, and all reasonable costs in
28 enforcing the rights under Labor Code § 2802, including, but not limited to attorneys’ fees.

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 (Violation of Labor Code § 226; Violation of IWC Wage Order)

4 80. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
5 though fully set forth herein.

6 81. Labor Code § 226(a) requires Defendant to provide each employee with an
7 accurate wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including, the following:
8 (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate
9 units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all
10 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
11 aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for
12 which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her
13 social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number,
14 (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly
15 rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
16 hourly rate by the employee.

17 82. During the relevant time period, Defendant has knowingly and intentionally failed
18 to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) on wage statements that were provided to Plaintiff and
19 Class Members. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly state the
20 gross and net wages earned, total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect, and the
21 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by Plaintiff and Class Members.

22 83. As a result of Defendant's knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
23 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-
24 protected rights. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members are deemed to suffer an injury
25 pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) where, as here, Defendant intentionally violated Labor Code §
26 226(a). Plaintiff and Class Members were denied both their legal right to receive, and their
27 protected interest in receiving, accurate itemized wage statements under Labor Code § 226(a). In
28 addition, because Defendant failed to provide the accurate rates of pay on wage statements,

1 Defendant prevented Plaintiff and Class Members from determining if all hours worked were
2 paid at the appropriate rate and the extent of the underpayment. Plaintiff had to file this lawsuit
3 in order to analyze the extent of the underpayment, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses
4 and lost time. Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had
5 Defendant provided the accurate hours worked, wages earned, and rates of pay. This has also
6 delayed Plaintiff's ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendant.

7 84. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of
8 all actual damages caused by Defendant's failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) or fifty
9 dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred and one hundred dollars
10 (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods in an amount not exceeding
11 four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) per employee, plus attorneys' fees and costs.

12 85. Defendant's violations of California Labor Code § 226(a) prevented Plaintiff and
13 Class Members from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wages paid to them and resulted
14 in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a result of Defendant's knowing and
15 intentional failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members
16 have suffered an injury, in the exact amount of damages and/or penalties to be shown according
17 to proof at trial.

18 SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

19 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE UPON SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT**

20 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203)

21 86. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
22 though fully set forth herein.

23 87. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee,
24 the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that
25 if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and
26 payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-
27 two (72) hours previous notice of an intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to
28 his or her wages at the time of quitting.

1 88. During the relevant time period, Defendant willfully failed to pay the Waiting
2 Time Subclass all their earned wages upon termination, including, but not limited to, proper
3 minimum wage and overtime compensation, meal period premiums, and rest period premiums
4 either at the time of discharge or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's
5 employ.

6 89. Defendant's failure to pay the Waiting Time Subclass all their earned wages at the
7 time of discharge or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ is in
8 violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

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

14 91. Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, the Waiting Time Subclass is entitled to recover
15 from Defendant the statutory penalty, which is defined as the Waiting Time Subclass members'
16 regular daily wages at their regular hourly rate of pay for each day they were not paid, up to a
17 maximum of thirty (30) days.

18 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17200, *ET SEQ.***

20 (Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

21 92. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
22 though fully set forth herein.

23 93. California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of
24 unfair competition, which includes any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice . .
25 . ."

26 94. A violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, may
27 be predicated on a violation of any state or federal law. In the instant case, Defendant's policies
28

1 and practices violated state law, causing Plaintiff and Class Members to suffer and continue to
2 suffer injuries-in-fact.

3 95. Defendant's policies and practices violated state law in at least the following
4 respects:

- 5 (a) Failing to pay all wages earned (including minimum wage, sick pay, and
6 overtime wages) to Plaintiff and Class Members at the proper rate in
7 violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and
8 1198.
- 9 (b) Failing to provide compliant meal periods without paying Plaintiff and
10 Class Members premium wages for every day said meal periods were not
11 provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.
- 12 (c) Failing to authorize or permit compliant rest breaks without paying
13 Plaintiff and Class Members premium wages for every day said rest
14 breaks were not authorized or permitted in violation of Labor Code §
15 226.7.
- 16 (d) Failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for necessary business-
17 related expenses in violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802.
- 18 (e) Failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized
19 wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226.
- 20 (f) Failing to timely pay all earned wages to the members of the Waiting
21 Time Subclass upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code
22 §§ 201, 202, and 203.

23 96. As alleged herein, Defendant systematically engaged in unlawful conduct in
24 violation of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, such as failing to pay all wages
25 (minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods and rest breaks or
26 compensation in lieu thereof, failing to reimburse necessary business-related costs and
27 expenses, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to pay all wages due and
28

owing upon separation of employment in a timely manner to the Waiting Time Subclass, all in order to decrease their costs of doing business and increase their profits.

97. At all relevant times herein, Defendant held themselves out to Plaintiff and Class Members as being knowledgeable concerning the labor and employment laws of California.

98. At all times relevant herein, Defendant intentionally avoided paying Plaintiff and Class Members wages and monies, thereby creating for Defendant an artificially lower cost of doing business in order to undercut their competitors and establish and/or gain a greater foothold in the marketplace.

99. By violating the foregoing statutes and regulations as herein alleged, Defendant's acts constitute unfair and unlawful business practices under California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

100. As a result of the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendant as alleged herein, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to injunctive relief, disgorgement, and restitution in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

101. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5. Defendant's conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, Class Members, and the general public. Based on Defendant's conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

ENFORCEMENT OF LABOR CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ. ("PAGA")

102. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporate by reference the previous paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

103. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil

1 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
2 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code § 2699.3.

3 104. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
4 specifically provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred
5 dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two
6 hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent pay
7 period in which Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

8 105. Defendants' conduct violates numerous Wage Order and Labor Code sections,
9 including, but not limited to, the following:

- 10 a. violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 510, 558, 1182.12, 1194,
11 1197, 1197.1 and 1198 for failure to timely pay all earned wages
12 (including minimum wage and overtime wages) owed to Plaintiff and
13 other aggrieved employees during employment and upon separation of
14 employment as herein alleged;
- 15 b. violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal
16 periods to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay
17 premium wages for missed meal periods as herein alleged;
- 18 c. violation of Labor Code § 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to
19 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium
20 wages for missed rest periods as herein alleged;
- 21 d. violation of Labor Code § 226 for failure to provide accurate itemized
22 wage statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein
23 alleged;
- 24 e. violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain
25 accurate and complete records showing, among other things, the hours
26 worked daily by and the wages paid to aggrieved employees; and
27
28

1 f. violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse
2 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for necessary business expenses
3 as herein alleged.

4 106. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” because he was employed by the alleged
5 violator and had one or more of the violations committed against him, and therefore is properly
6 suited to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

7 107. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code § 2699.3
8 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself and
9 all other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

10 108. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to
11 recover civil penalties, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code sections
12 cited above.

13 109. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney’s fees and costs incurred
14 herein.

15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 On Plaintiff’s own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff prays
17 for relief and judgment against Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 18 1. For certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 of the proposed
19 Class and any other appropriate subclass;
- 20 2. For appointment of Cesar Galicia as class representative;
- 21 3. For appointment of Aegis Law Firm, PC, as class counsel for all purposes;
- 22 4. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof at trial;
- 23 5. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
24 not limited to, unpaid wages, unreimbursed expenses, benefits, and penalties;
- 25 6. For economic and/or special damages in an amount according to proof at trial;
- 26 7. For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2;
- 27 8. For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to
28 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

1 9. For injunctive relief as provided by the California Labor Code and California
2 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

3 10. For restitution as provided by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

4 11. For an order requiring Defendant to restore and disgorge all funds to each
5 employee acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, unfair,
6 or fraudulent and, therefore, constituting unfair competition under Business and Professions
7 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

8 12. For pre-judgment interest;

9 13. For civil penalties;

10 14. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted
11 by law, including, but not limited to, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and Labor Code §§
12 226(e), 1194, and 2698 *et seq.*; and

13 15. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

14
15 Dated: May 27, 2022

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

16
17 By: _____

Jessica L. Campbell

Alexander G.L. Davies

Attorneys for Plaintiff Cesar Galicia