

February 22, 2022

Filed via the LWDA's PAGA Claim Notice Online Form

Copies Sent via Certified U.S. Mail to:

Human Resources
Pinnacle Farm Labor, Inc.
1868 Padre Lane
Camarillo, CA 93012

Pinnacle Farm Labor, Inc.
c/o Mario Alberto Valencia Zepeda
1868 Padre Lane
Camarillo, CA 93012

**Re: *Nelson Arevalo v. Pinnacle Farm Labor, Inc.*
Notice of Intent to File Suit Pursuant to California Labor Code
Section 2699**

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Nelson Arevalo ("Plaintiff") and a group of the putative class members in a forthcoming lawsuit against Pinnacle Farm Labor, Inc. ("Defendant"). The action, entitled *Nelson Arevalo v. Pinnacle Farm Labor, Inc.*, is to be filed in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Ventura (the "Action"). A copy of the complaint as currently drafted, and as is intended to be filed in the Action, is enclosed as **Exhibit A**. This letter incorporates by reference the facts, law, and allegations of Exhibit A.

This letter serves as notice pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), codified at California Labor Code sections 2698 through 2699.6, that we intend to include representative claims in the Action for civil penalties under PAGA on behalf of a group of aggrieved employees. For the purposes of this letter, "Aggrieved Employees" is defined as: *All individuals who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California, from one year prior to the mailing of this notice through the date of trial.*

As set forth in more detail in Exhibit A, Defendant violated its obligations to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees under California law by: failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, failing to pay all overtime wages earned, failing to provide lawful rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums, failing to provide lawful meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums, failing to maintain accurate records, failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses, failing to provide accurate and complete wage statements, failing to pay all wages in full and on time during employment, failing to pay all wages due upon termination, failing to provide shade/recovery periods as required by law, failing to provide potable water as required by law, and failing to provide suitable toilet facilities as required by law.

Notice of Intent to File PAGA

Action February 22, 2022

Page 2 of 2

Because of these systemic violations, Defendant violated: Labor Code sections 142.3, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 1174, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2084, and California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders Wage Order 14-2001, and others that may be applicable. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 3364, subd. (b), 3395, subds. (a)(1), (c), (d)(1), 11140.) The enclosed Complaint further details: **(1)** the alleged violations; **(2)** the facts and theories supporting these violations; **(3)** the people and entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions at issue; and **(4)** the illegal practices instituted by Defendant.

Together with this correspondence, the enclosed complaint provides notice that we intend to proceed with a claim for civil penalties in the Action pursuant to PAGA. (See Lab. Code, §§ 2698–2699.6.) We intend to fully prosecute the representative claims alleged in the complaint, including by obtaining civil penalties under PAGA.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,


JONATHAN MELMED

EXHIBIT A

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.
Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218)
jm@melmedlaw.com
Laura Supanich (SBN 314805)
lms@melmedlaw.com
Krikor Kouyoumdjian (SBN 336148)
krikor@melmedlaw.com
1801 Century Park East, Suite 850
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: (310) 824-3828
Fax: (310) 862-6851

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

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

NELSON AREVALO, an individual, on behalf
of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PINNACLE FARM LABOR, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 TO 50,

Defendants.

CASE NUMBER:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Failure to Pay All Minimum Wages,
2. Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages,
3. Failure to Provide Rest Periods and Pay Missed Rest Period Premiums,
4. Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Pay Missed Meal Period Premiums,
5. Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records,
6. Failure to Pay Wages Timely during Employment,
7. Failure to Pay All Wages Earned and Unpaid at Separation,
8. Failure to Indemnify All Necessary Business Expenditures,
9. Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements,
10. Failure to Provide Recovery Periods, and
11. Violations of California's Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 17200–17210).

Demand for Jury Trial

1 Plaintiff NELSON AREVALO (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all other similarly
2 situated employees within the State of California, complains and alleges of defendants PINNACLE
3 FARM LABOR, INC. and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively, “Defendants”), and each of them, as follows:

4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a class action complaint brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
6 section 382.

7 2. The “Class Period” as used herein, is defined as the period from four years prior to the
8 filing of this action and continuing into the present and ongoing. Defendants’ violations of California’s
9 laws as described more fully below have been ongoing throughout the Class Period and are still
10 ongoing.

11 3. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of himself and the following class: *All*
12 *individuals who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during*
13 *the Class Period* (the “Class Members”). (Code Civ. Proc., § 382.)

14 4. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the Class Members, as a class action,
15 against Defendants for:

- 16 A. Failure to pay all minimum wages,
- 17 B. Failure to pay all overtime wages,
- 18 C. Failure to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums,
- 19 D. Failure to provide meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums,
- 20 E. Failure to maintain accurate employment records,
- 21 F. Failure to pay wages timely during employment,
- 22 G. Failure to pay all wages earned and unpaid at separation,
- 23 H. Failure to indemnify all necessary business expenditures,
- 24 I. Failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements,
- 25 J. Failure to provide recovery periods, and
- 26 K. Violations of California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) (Bus. & Prof.
27 Code, §§ 17200–17210).

28 ///

1 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the California Industrial
2 Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order applicable to the facts of this case is IWC Wage Order 14-
3 2001 (the “Applicable Wage Order”) and possibly others that may be applicable. (Cal. Code of Regs.,
4 tit. 8, § 11140.) Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the definition of “Applicable Wage
5 Order” with greater specificity or add additional IWC Wage Orders if additional applicable wage orders
6 are discovered in litigation.

7 **II. JURISDICTION & VENUE**

8 6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein
9 pursuant to Article VI, section 10, of the California Constitution and Code of Civil Procedure section
10 410.10 because this is a civil action in which the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest, exceeds
11 \$25,000, and because each cause of action asserted arises under the laws of the State of California or
12 is subject to adjudication in the courts of the State of California.

13 7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants have caused
14 injuries in the County of Ventura and the State of California through their acts, and by their violation
15 of the California Labor Code and California state common law. Defendants transact millions of dollars
16 of business within the State of California. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have
17 an agent or agents within the County of Ventura, and/or otherwise are found within the County of
18 Ventura, and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

19 8. Venue as to Defendants is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to section 395 of the
20 Code of Civil Procedure. Defendants operate within California and do business within Ventura County,
21 California. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and all of Defendants’
22 employees identified above within Ventura County and surrounding counties where Defendants may
23 remotely operate.

24 9. This matter is not appropriate for removal under the Class Action Fairness Act (28
25 U.S.C. § 1332) as the amount in controversy for Plaintiff’s and the Class Members’ claims, in
26 aggregate, is less than \$5 million. Additionally, all the allegations herein occurred in the State of
27 California. As such, even if the amount in controversy did exceed \$5 million this matter would still
28 not be appropriate for removal under the “local controversy” exception to the Class Action Fairness

1 Act. (28 U.S.C. § 1332, subd. (d)(4)(A).)

2 **III. THE PARTIES**

3 **A. PLAINTIFF**

4 10. At all relevant times, Plaintiff, who is over the age of 18, was and currently is a citizen
5 of California residing in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt hourly
6 employee in the County of Ventura.

7 11. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following class pursuant to
8 section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure as follows: *All individuals who are or were employed by*
9 *Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the Class Period* (the “Class Members”).

10 12. The Class Members, at all times pertinent hereto, are or were employees of Defendants
11 during the relevant statutory period.

12 **B. DEFENDANTS**

13 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants were authorized
14 to and doing business in Ventura County and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the other
15 Class Members during the applicable statutory periods. Plaintiff and the other Class Members were,
16 and are, subject to Defendants’ policies and/or practices complained of herein and have been deprived
17 of the rights guaranteed to them by: California Labor Code sections 142.3, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210,
18 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 1174, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802,
19 2804, and others that may be applicable; California Business and Professions Code sections 17200
20 through 17210 (“UCL”); section 3364, subdivision (b), of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations;
21 section 3395, subdivisions (a)(1), (c), and (d)(1) of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations; and
22 the Applicable Wage Order (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11140).

23 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the Class
24 Period, Defendants did (and continue to do) business in the State of California, County of Ventura.
25 Defendants operations are headquartered in Ventura County.

26 15. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
27 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as Does 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said defendants
28 are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to amend this

1 complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and
2 thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate, were
3 responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff
4 and the other Class Members to be subject to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and
5 damages complained of herein.

6 16. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
7 herein, Defendants were and/or are the employers of Plaintiff and the other Class Members. At all
8 times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged
9 to have been done by the named Defendants. Furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the
10 agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents
11 of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said
12 agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, or otherwise ratified
13 every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

14 17. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a
15 joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of and in
16 pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff is informed,
17 and believes, and thereon alleges, that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff
18 and the other Class Members.

19 **IV. COMMON FACTS & ALLEGATIONS**

20 18. Plaintiff and the other Class Members (collectively, the “Class Members”) are, and were
21 at all relevant times, employed by the Defendants within the State of California.

22 19. The Class Members are, and were, at all relevant times, non-exempt employees for the
23 purposes of minimum wages, overtime, rest breaks, meal periods, and the other claims alleged in this
24 complaint.

25 20. Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within the statutory Class Period,
26 working as an hourly, non-exempt general laborer for Defendants.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **A. MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

2 21. Labor Code section 1197 requires employees to be paid at least the minimum wage fixed
3 by the IWC, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. Similarly, Labor Code
4 section 1194 entitles “any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage . . . to recover in a
5 civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage.” Likewise, the Applicable
6 Wage Order also obligates employers to pay each employee minimum wages for all hours worked.
7 (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11140.) Labor Code section 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an
8 employee under conditions that the IWC Wage Orders prohibit.

9 22. These minimum wage standards apply to each hour that employees work. Therefore,
10 an employer’s failure to pay for any particular time worked by an employee is unlawful, even if
11 averaging an employee’s total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage
12 above minimum wage. (*Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324.)

13 23. Here, Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of the
14 law during the relevant statutory periods. The Class Members were not compensated for all hours
15 worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants and/or
16 suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and the Applicable Wage Order. Among
17 other violations, the Class Members were subject to the control of Defendants while off-the-clock and
18 did not receive minimum wage for each hour worked.

19 24. Additionally, the Class Members were not paid all wages for all hours worked due to
20 Defendants’ uniform payroll policies and practices that unfairly rounded employees’ wages to the
21 detriment of the Class Members. This rounding policy routinely failed to capture the entirety of the
22 hours the Class Members worked and was structured in a way that in favored underpayment. (See
23 *See’s Candy Shops, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 889, 907.) As a result, the Class
24 Members suffered periodic shortages in the hours for which they were compensated. This
25 uncompensated time violated California’s requirement that employees be compensated for all hours
26 worked. As a result of this practice, the Class Members were not compensated their minimum wages
27 for all hours worked.

28 ///

1 25. Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2, subdivision (a), provide that an
2 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees
3 the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages
4 due and interest thereon.

5 26. When employees, such as the Class Members, are not paid for all hours worked under
6 Labor Code section 1194, they are entitled to recover minimum wages for the time which they received
7 no compensation. (See *Sillah v. Command International Security Services* (N.D. Cal. 2015) 154
8 F.Supp.3d 891 [employees suing for failure to pay overtime could recover liquidated damages under
9 Labor Code section 1194.2 if they also showed they were paid less than minimum wage].)

10 27. Labor Code section 1197.1 authorizes employees who are paid less than the minimum
11 wage fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order of the IWC, a civil penalty, among other
12 damages, as follows:

13 (1) “For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one
14 hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period
15 for which the employee is underpaid.”

16 (2) “For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two
17 hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
18 period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the
19 initial violation is intentionally committed.” (Lab. Code, § 1197.1, subd.

20 (a).)

21 28. As set forth above, Defendants failed to fully compensate the Class Members for all
22 minimum wages. Accordingly, the Class Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages for
23 violations of Labor Code section 1197.1.

24 29. Based upon these same factual allegations, the Class Members are likewise entitled to
25 penalties under Labor Code sections 1199.

26 **B. OVERTIME VIOLATIONS**

27 30. Labor Code section 510 requires employers to compensate employees who work more
28 than eight hours in one workday, forty hours in a workweek, and for the first eight hours worked on

1 the seventh consecutive day no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.
2 (Lab. Code, § 510, subd. (a).) Further, Labor Code section 510 obligates employers to compensate
3 employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve
4 hours in a day or more than eight hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. (Lab. Code, § 510,
5 subd. (a).)

6 31. IWC Wage Order 14-2001, section 3(A), is similar, but provides in pertinent part:

7 “(1) Such employees shall not be employed more than ten (10) hours
8 in any one workday or more than six (6) days in any workweek unless
9 the employee receives one and one-half (1½) times such employee’s
10 regular rate of pay for all hours worked over ten (10) hours in any
11 workday and for the first eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) day of work
12 and double the employee’s regular rate of pay for all hours worked over
13 eight (8) on the seventh (7th) day of work in the workweek.

14 “(2) For employers of more than 25 employees:

15 “(a) Starting January 1, 2019, an employee shall not be employed
16 more than nine and one-half (9½) hours per workday or fifty-five (55)
17 hours per workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (1½)
18 times such employee’s regular rate of pay for all hours worked over nine
19 and one-half (9½) hours in any one workday or more than fifty-five (55)
20 hours in any one workweek.

21 “(b) Starting January 1, 2020, an employee shall not be employed
22 more than nine (9) hours per workday or fifty (50) hours per workweek
23 unless the employee receives one and one-half (1½) times such
24 employee’s regular rate of pay for all hours worked over nine (9) hours
25 in any one workday or more than fifty (50) hours in any one workweek.”

26 (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11140, subd. 3.)

27 32. In accordance with Labor Code section 1194 and the Applicable Wage Order, the Class
28 Members could not then agree and cannot now agree to work for a lesser wage than the amount

provided by Labor Code sections 510 or the Applicable Wage Order.

33. Here, Defendants violated their duty to accurately and completely compensate the Class Members for all overtime worked. The Class Members worked hours that entitled them to overtime compensation under the law but were not fully compensated for those hours.

34. Defendants also had a policy and practice of denying the Class Members meal breaks, but nevertheless deducting meal break time from the Class Members' pay. As a result, the Class Members' on-the-clock hours were unlawfully reduced below what was actually worked and, by extension, overtime hours were also reduced below what was actually worked. The Class Members were thus shorted the full amount of overtime pay lawfully owed.

35. These actions were and are in clear violation of California's overtime laws as set forth in Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1199, and the Applicable Wage Order. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11140.) As a result of Defendants' faulty policies and practices, the Class Members were not compensated for all hours worked or paid accurate overtime compensation.

C. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

36. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Order, Defendants were and are required to provide the Class Members with compensated, duty-free rest periods of not less than ten minutes for every major fraction of four hours worked. Under the Applicable Wage Order, an employer must authorize and permit all employees to take ten minute duty free rest periods for every major fraction of four hours worked. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11140.)

37. Likewise, Labor Code section 226.7 provides that "[a]n employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission" (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (b).) Labor Code section 226.7 also provides that employers must pay their employees one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a "meal or rest or recovery period is not provided." (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c).) Thus, the Wage Orders set when and for how long the rest period must take place and the Labor Code establishes that violations of the IWC Wage Orders are unlawful and sets forth the premium pay employer must pay their employees when employers fail to provide rest periods.

1 38. The California Supreme Court has held that, during required rest periods, “employers
2 must relieve their employees of all duties and relinquish any control over how employees spend their
3 break time.” (*Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 260.) Relinquishing
4 control over employees during rest periods requires that employees be “free to leave the employer’s
5 premises” and be “permitted to attend to personal business.” (*Id.* at p. 275.) The *Brinker* Court
6 explained in the context of rest breaks that employer liability attaches from adopting an unlawful
7 policy:

8 “An employer is required to authorize and permit the amount of rest break time
9 called for under the wage order for its industry. If it does not—if, for example,
10 it adopts a uniform policy authorizing and permitting only one rest break for
11 employees working a seven-hour shift when two are required—it has violated
12 the wage order and is liable.” (*Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53
13 Cal.4th 1004, 1033.)

14 39. Here, Defendants did not permit the Class Members to take compliant duty-free rest
15 breaks, free from Defendants’ control as required by Labor Code section 226.7, the Applicable Wage
16 Order, and applicable precedent. (See *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257,
17 269 [concluding that “during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish
18 control over how employees spend their time.”].) At all relevant times, the Class Members were not
19 provided with legally-compliant and timely rest periods of at least ten minutes for each four hour work
20 period, or major fraction thereof due to Defendants’ unlawful rest period policies/practices. The Class
21 Members were often expected and required to continue working through rest periods to meet the
22 expectations Defendants and finish the workday. In some cases when the Class Members worked more
23 than ten hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a third mandated rest period. As
24 a result, the Class Members were unable to take compliant rest periods.

25 40. In such cases where Defendants did not offer the Class Members the opportunity to
26 receive a compliant off-duty rest period, “the court may not conclude employees voluntarily chose to
27 skip those breaks.” (*Alberts v. Aurora Behavioral Health Care* (2015) 241 Cal.App.4th 388, 410
28 (2015) [“If an employer fails to provide legally compliant meal or rest breaks, the court may not

1 conclude employees voluntarily chose to skip those breaks.”]; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court*,
2 *supra*, 53 Cal.4th at p. 1033 [“No issue of waiver ever arises for a rest break that was required by law
3 but never authorized; if a break is not authorized, an employee has no opportunity to decline to take
4 it.”].)

5 41. In addition to failing to authorize and permit compliant rest periods, the Class Members
6 were not compensated with one hour’s worth of pay at their regular rate of compensation when they
7 were not provided with a compliant rest period in accordance with Labor Code section 226.7,
8 subdivision (c). Thus, Defendants have violated Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage
9 Order.

10 42. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to recover, on behalf of himself and other non-
11 exempt employees, rest period premiums and penalties.

12 **D. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS**

13 43. Labor Code section 512 and the Applicable Wage Order require employers to provide
14 employees with a thirty-minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal period within the first five hours of
15 work. (Lab. Code, § 512, subd. (a) [“An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
16 more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30
17 minutes”]; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11140 [“No employer shall employ any person for a work
18 period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes”].)
19 Additionally, an employee who works more than ten hours per day is entitled to receive a second thirty-
20 minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal period. (Lab. Code, § 512, subd. (a) [“An employer shall not
21 employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee
22 with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes”].)

23 44. “An on-duty meal period is permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
24 employee from being relieved of all duty and the parties agree in writing to an on-duty paid meal
25 break.” (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.* (2016) 5 Cal.App.5th 926, 932.) The written agreement must
26 include a provision allowing the employee to revoke it at any time. (*Ibid.*) Generally, the California
27 Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (“DLSE”) and courts
28 have “found that the nature of the work exception applies: (1) where the work has some particular

1 external force that requires the employee to be on duty at all times, and (2) where the employee is the
2 sole employee of a particular employer.” (*Id.* at p. 945, internal quotation marks omitted; *Abdullah v.*
3 *U.S. Security Associates, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2013) 731 F.3d 952, 958–959.) “[I]t is the employer’s obligation
4 to determine whether the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved before requiring
5 an employee to take an on-duty meal period.” (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.*, *supra*, 5 Cal.App.5th
6 at p. 946.)

7 45. Here, the Class Members were never asked to sign any enforceable document agreeing
8 to an on-duty meal period. Moreover, nothing in the nature of their work involved the kind of “external
9 force” that might justify on-duty meal breaks. (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.*, *supra*, 5 Cal.App.5th
10 at p. 945.) Nevertheless, Defendants did not provide compliant off-duty meal periods within the first
11 five hours of work for the Class Members.

12 46. As with rest breaks, meal breaks must be duty-free. (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
13 *Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1035 [“The IWC’s wage orders have long made a meal period’s
14 duty-free nature its defining characteristic.”].) Relinquishing control over employees during meal
15 periods requires that employees be “free to leave the employer’s premises” and be “permitted to attend
16 to personal business.” (*Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, *supra*, 2 Cal.5th at p. 275.) Under
17 Labor Code section 512, if an employer maintains a uniform policy that does not authorize and permit
18 the amount of meal time called for under the law (as specified in the Labor Code and/or applicable
19 IWC Wage Order), “it has violated the wage order and is liable.” (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior*
20 *Court*, *supra*, 53 Cal.4th at p. 1033.)

21 47. During the applicable statutory periods here, the Class Members were denied legally-
22 compliant and timely off-duty meal periods of at least thirty minutes due to Defendants’ unlawful meal
23 period policy and practices. As a result of Defendants’ uniform meal period policies and practices, the
24 Class Members were often not permitted to take compliant first meal periods before the end of the fifth
25 hour of work. The Class Members were also not permitted to take second meal periods for shifts in
26 excess of ten hours. Defendants thus violated Labor Code section 512 and the Applicable Wage Order
27 by failing to advise, authorize, or permit the Class Members to receive thirty-minute, off-duty meal
28 periods within the first five hours of their shifts.

1 48. Labor Code section 226.7 provides that “[a]n employer shall not require an employee
2 to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or
3 applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.” (Lab. Code, § 226.7,
4 subd. (b).) Labor Code section 226.7, subdivision (c), and the Applicable Wage Order further obligate
5 employers to pay employees one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation
6 for each workday that the meal period is not provided. (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c); Cal. Code of
7 Regs., tit. 8, § 11140 [“If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with
8 the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
9 employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.”].)

10 49. Accordingly, for each day that the Class Members did not receive compliant meal
11 periods, they were and are entitled to receive meal period premiums pursuant to Labor Code section
12 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Order. Defendants, however, failed to pay the Class Members
13 applicable meal period premiums for many workdays that the employees did not receive a compliant
14 meal period. Thus, Defendants have violated Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage
15 Order.

16 50. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to recover, on behalf of himself and other non-
17 exempt employees, meal period premiums and penalties.

18 **E. UNTIMELY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT**

19 51. Labor Code section 204 expressly requires employers who pay employees on a weekly,
20 biweekly, or semimonthly basis to pay all wages “not more than seven calendar days following the
21 close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a), makes employers who violate
22 Labor Code section 204 subject to a penalty of:

23 “(1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
24 failure to pay each employee.

25 “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional
26 violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each
27 employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.” (Lab.
28 Code, § 210, subd. (a).)

1 52. Notably, the penalty provided by Labor Code section 210 is “[i]n addition to, and
2 entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article” (Lab. Code, § 210,
3 subd. (a).)

4 53. Due to Defendants’ failure to pay the Class Members the wages described above, along
5 with rest and meal break premiums, Defendants failed to timely pay the Class Members within seven
6 calendar days following the close of payroll in accordance with Labor Code section 204 on a regular
7 and consistent basis. (See *Parson v. Golden State FC, LLC* (N.D. Cal., May 2, 2016, No. 16-CV-
8 00405-JST) 2016 WL 1734010, at p. *3–5, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58299 [finding that a failure to pay
9 rest period premiums can support claims under Labor Code sections 203 and 204].)

10 **F. UNTIMELY WAGES AT SEPARATION**

11 54. Labor Code section 203 provides “if an employer willfully fails to pay . . . any wages
12 of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty”
13 for up to thirty days. (Lab. Code § 203; *Mamika v. Barca* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 487, 492.) As a result
14 of Defendants’ failure to pay the Class Members for the wages described above, along with rest and
15 meal break premiums, Defendants violated and continue to violate Labor Code section 203.

16 55. Due to Defendants’ faulty pay policies, those Class Members whose employment with
17 Defendants concluded were not compensated for each and every hour worked at the appropriate rate.
18 Defendants have failed to pay formerly-employed Class Members whose sums were certain at the time
19 of termination within at least seventy-two hours of their resignation and have failed to pay those sums
20 for thirty days thereafter.

21 **G. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

22 56. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 2802, which
23 states that “an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or losses
24 incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her
25 obedience to the directions of the employer.” The purpose of this section is to “prevent employers
26 from passing along their operating expenses onto their employees.” (*Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers,*
27 *Inc.* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 554, 562.)

28 ///

1 57. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 2804, which
2 states that “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits
3 of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his
4 personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State.”

5 58. Thus, the Class Members were and are entitled to reimbursement for the expenses they
6 incurred during the course of their duties. The duty to reimburse even extends to the use of equipment
7 the employee may already own and would be required to pay for anyway. (*Cochran v. Schwan’s Home*
8 *Serv., Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1144 [“The threshold question in this case is this: Does an
9 employer always have to reimburse an employee for the reasonable expense of the mandatory use of a
10 personal cell phone, or is the reimbursement obligation limited to the situation in which the employee
11 incurred an extra expense that he or she would not have otherwise incurred absent the job? The answer
12 is that reimbursement is always required. Otherwise, the employer would receive a windfall because it
13 would be passing its operating expenses on to the employee.”].)

14 59. Here, Defendants failed to fully reimburse the Class Members for necessary
15 expenditures incurred as a direct consequence and requirement of performing their job duties, including
16 but not limited to the costs associated with their personal cell phone, personal vehicle, and tools they
17 required to perform their work. Consequently, Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section
18 2802.

19 **H. WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**

20 60. Defendants also failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with
21 Labor Code sections 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (5), and (9). Labor Code section 226, subdivision
22 (a), obligates employers, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment to furnish an itemized wage
23 statement in writing showing:

- 24 (1) The gross wages earned;
25 (2) The total hours worked by the employee;
26 (3) The number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece
27 rate if the employee is paid on a piece rate basis;.

28 ///

- 1 (4) All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written
2 orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
3 (5) The net wages earned;
4 (6) The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
5 (7) The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or
6 her social security number or an employee identification number other
7 than a social security number;
8 (8) The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
9 (9) All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
10 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
11 employee.

12 61. Due to Defendants' failure to pay the Class Members properly as described above, the
13 wage statements issued do not indicate the correct amount of gross wages earned, total hours worked,
14 or the net wages earned, or the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
15 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Thus, Defendants have violated Labor
16 Code section 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (5), and (9).

17 62. In addition to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Defendants also knowingly and
18 intentionally failed to provide the Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements in violation
19 of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e). Defendants knew that they were not providing the Class
20 Members with wage statements required by California law but nevertheless failed to correct their
21 unlawful practices and policies. (See *Garnett v. ADT LLC* (E.D. Cal. 2015) 139 F.Supp.3d 1121, 1134
22 [finding the defendant knowingly and intentionally violated Labor Code section 226 because the
23 "[d]efendant knew that it was not providing total hours worked to plaintiff or other employees paid on
24 commission" even though it believed that employees paid solely on commission or commission and
25 salary "are exempt and therefore we do not record hours on a wage statement."].)

26 I. RECORDKEEPING VIOLATIONS

27 63. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), requires employers to keep an accurate record
28 of, among other things, all hours worked by employees. Labor Code section 226.3 provides, in

1 pertinent part, as follows:

2 “Any employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a
3 civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per
4 violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee
5 for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to
6 provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the records
7 required in subdivision (a) of Section 226. The civil penalties provided for in
8 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.” (Lab. Code,
9 § 226.3, emphasis added.)

10 64. Likewise, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), requires every employer, including
11 Defendants, to:

12 “Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which
13 employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by
14 and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any
15 applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or
16 establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established
17 for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not
18 less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from
19 maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis,
20 piece-rate units earned.” (Lab. Code, § 1174, subd. (d), emphasis added.)

21 65. As explained in detail above, Defendants failed to provide the Class Members with
22 accurate itemized wage statements. Defendants did so, in part, because they failed to accurately track
23 hours worked by the Class Members. Defendants have thus failed to keep accurate records of the “total
24 hours worked by the employee[s]” in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), and are
25 therefore subject to the penalties provided by Labor Code section 226.3. These penalties are “in
26 addition to any other penalty provided by law.” (Lab. Code, § 226.3.)

27 66. The failure to accurately track hours worked also resulted in a failure of Defendants to
28 keep a record of all “payroll records showing the hours worked daily by” Defendants’ employees,

1 including Plaintiff and the other Class Members, in violation of Labor Code section 1174, subdivision
2 (d).

3 **J. POTABLE WATER VIOLATIONS**

4 67. Labor Code section 142.3 authorizes the California Occupational Safety and Health
5 Standards Board (“OSHSB”) to adopt occupational safety and health standards and orders. Pursuant
6 to its authority, OSHSB has adopted the “Maria Isabel Vasquez Jimenez Heat Illness Standard,” which
7 applies to all outdoor places of employment. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3395, subd. (a)(1).) This
8 standard requires that all outdoor employees have access to potable water that is “fresh, pure, suitably
9 cool” and provided to employees free of charge. The water must be located as close as practicable to
10 the areas where employees are working. If not plumbed or otherwise continuously supplied, it must be
11 furnished at the beginning of the shift in sufficient quantity to provide one quart per employee per hour
12 for the entire shift. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3395, subd. (c).)

13 68. Here, Defendants failed to provide the Class Members water that was fit to drink, or
14 potable, and free from odors that would discourage workers from drinking the water. No clean water
15 source was made available to Defendants’ employees, including the Class Members. This failure, in
16 addition to violating OSHSB’s safety and health standards (and, by extension, the Labor Code),
17 resulted in a failure to provide adequate cool-down recovery periods pursuant to Labor Code section
18 226.7. (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c) [“If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or
19 recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or
20 applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety
21 and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall
22 pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each
23 workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.”], emphasis added.)

24 **K. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SHADE FOR “COOL DOWN**
25 **PERIODS”**

26 69. Labor Code section 226.7(a) states that, “‘recovery period’ means a cooldown period
27 afforded an employee to prevent heat illness.” Labor Code section 226.7(b) states that, “[a]n employer
28 shall not require an employee to work during a ... recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable

1 statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the
2 Occupational and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.” Labor
3 Code section 226.7(c) states that “[i]f an employer fails to provide an employee a ... recovery period
4 in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable
5 regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and
6 Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the
7 employee one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each work day
8 that the ... recovery period is not provided.”

9 70. California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395(d)(1) provides that, “[s]hade shall
10 be present when the temperature exceeds 80 degrees Fahrenheit. When the outdoor temperature in the
11 work area exceeds 80 degrees Fahrenheit, the employer shall have and maintain one or more areas with
12 shade at all times while employees are present that are either open to the air or provided with ventilation
13 or cooling ... [t]he shade shall be located as close as practicable to the areas where the employees are
14 working.”

15 71. Defendants *affirmatively denied* its employees timely access to shade upon its
16 employees’ requests. Defendants failed to maintain shade open to the air and failed to provide
17 ventilation or cooling at all times while its employees were present. Defendants further failed to
18 provide sufficient shade to accommodate the number of employees during a typical non-compliant rest
19 period, so they were and are able to sit in a normal posture in the shade without having to be in physical
20 contact with each other. No shade was provided near the areas where employees were and are working.

21 72. Defendants *affirmatively denied* its employees the ability to take preventative cool-
22 down rest in the shade when they felt the need to do so in order to protect themselves from overheating.
23 In further violation, Defendants failed to monitor any of its employees during high-heat temperatures,
24 and during high-heat temperatures failed to inquire if they were experiencing symptoms of heat illness
25 (i.e. pale skin, heavy sweating, headache, muscle cramps and fatigue). Thus, Plaintiff and Class
26 Members are entitled to an additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they were not
27 provided with compliant recovery periods.

28 ///

1 **L. FAILURE TO PROVIDE RESTROOMS**

2 73. Labor Code section 142.3 authorizes the California Occupational Safety and Health
3 Standards Board (“OSHSB”) to adopt occupational safety and health standards and orders. Pursuant
4 to its authority, OSHSB has adopted a standard requiring California employers to provide separate
5 toilet facilities for males and females based on the numbers of employees of each sex. (Cal. Code
6 Regs., tit. 8, § 3364.) These toilet facilities must be “kept clean, maintained in good working order and
7 be accessible to the employees at all times.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3364, subd. (b).) Likewise,
8 “[w]here practicable, toilet facilities should be within 200 feet of locations at which workers are
9 regularly employed” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3364, subd. (b).)

10 74. Here, Defendants failed to provide the Class Members with suitable toilet facilities
11 within a reasonable distance of their worksite. The Class Members were often forced to urinate and
12 defecate outdoors in unsanitary, humiliating, and exposed conditions. This failure, in addition to
13 violating OSHSB’s safety and health standards (and, by extension, the Labor Code), resulted in a failure
14 to provide adequate cool-down recovery periods pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, subdivision
15 (c).

16 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

17 75. As mentioned above, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the Class
18 Members pursuant to section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

19 76. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all
20 members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the class is unknown to Plaintiff
21 at this time; however, it is estimated that the number of Class Members is greater than 100 individuals.
22 The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants’ employment
23 records.

24 77. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of**
25 **Interest:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated
26 non-exempt employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members
27 including, without limitation to:

28 ///

1 A. Whether Defendants' pay policies/practices resulted in a failure to pay the Class
2 Members for all hours worked, including all minimum wages;

3 B. Whether Defendants' pay policies/practices resulted in a failure to pay the Class
4 Members for all required overtime wages at the Class Members' regular rate of pay;

5 C. Whether Defendants' rest period policies and practices afforded legally
6 compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

7 D. Whether Defendants' meal period policies and practices afforded legally
8 compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

9 E. Whether Defendants maintained accurate employment records;

10 F. Whether Defendants timely paid all wages during employment;

11 G. Whether Defendants timely paid all wages earned and unpaid at separation;

12 H. Whether Defendants indemnified their employees for all necessary business
13 expenditures;

14 I. Whether Defendants furnished legally-compliant wage statements to the Class
15 Members pursuant to Labor Code section 226;

16 J. Whether Defendants' recovery period policies and practices afforded legally
17 compliant recovery periods or compensation in lieu thereof; and

18 K. Whether Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and the Applicable Wage
19 Order amounted to a violation of California's UCL.

20 **78. Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact
21 predominate over questions that affect only individual Class Members. The common questions of law
22 set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' uniform policies and practices
23 applicable to each individual class member, such as Defendants' uniform policy and practice of failing
24 to pay for all hours worked, Defendants' uniform policies and practices which failed to provide
25 compliant rest periods, Defendants' uniform policies and practices which failed to provide compliant
26 meal periods, Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and others. As such,
27 the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class
28 member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

1 79. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Class Members
2 because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the
3 statute(s) of limitation applicable to each cause of action pleaded in this complaint. As alleged herein,
4 Plaintiff, like the other Class Members, was deprived of minimum, regular, and overtime wages
5 because of Defendants' unlawful timekeeping policies and practices, was deprived of rest periods and
6 premium wages in lieu thereof, was deprived of meal periods and premium wages in lieu thereof, was
7 deprived of recovery periods and premium wages in lieu thereof, was subject to Defendants' uniform
8 rest period policies and practices, was subject to Defendants' uniform meal period policies and
9 practices, was not provided accurate itemized wage statements, was not paid all wages in full and on
10 time, and was subject to other similar policies and practices to which the Class Members were subject.

11 80. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to
12 represent fairly and adequately the interests of the Class Members. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are
13 ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the Class Members and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's
14 attorneys have prosecuted numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal court in the past
15 and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class Members.

16 81. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an
17 important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California.
18 These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers
19 who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior
20 economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature
21 of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and the Class Members make the class action
22 format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If
23 each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an
24 unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of
25 each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

26 82. Moreover, requiring each Class Member to pursue an individual remedy would also
27 discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action
28 against their former or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent

1 damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by
2 the individual Class Members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or
3 varying verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual Class Members against Defendants
4 herein, and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants or
5 legal determinations with respect to individual Class Members which would, as a practical matter, be
6 dispositive of the interest of the other Class Members not parties to adjudications or which would
7 substantially impair or impede the ability of the Class Members to protect their interests.

8 83. Further, the claims of the individual Class Members are not sufficiently large to warrant
9 vigorous individual prosecution considering the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As
10 such, the Class Members identified above are maintainable as a class under section 382 of the Code of
11 Civil Procedure.

12 **VI. CAUSES OF ACTION**

13 **First Cause of Action**

14 *Failure to Pay All Minimum Wages*

15 *(Against All Defendants)*

16 84. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

17 85. Section 4 of the Applicable Wage Order and Labor Code section 1197 establish the right
18 of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law. (Lab. Code,
19 § 1197; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11140.) Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2,
20 subdivision (a), provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage as required
21 by Labor Code section 1197 may recover the unpaid balance, together with attorneys' fees and costs
22 of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid wages and interest accrued
23 thereon.

24 86. Here, Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of the
25 law during the relevant statutory periods. Plaintiff and the other Class Members were not compensated
26 for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of
27 Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and the Applicable Wage Order.

28 ///

87. Labor Code section 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under conditions that the IWC Wage Orders prohibit. Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2, subdivision (a), provide that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

88. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff and the other Class Members have sustained economic damages, including but not limited to unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and they are entitled to recover economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief because of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and Applicable Wage Order.

89. Defendants' practices and policies regarding illegal employee compensation are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the other Class Members in a civil action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages, liquidated damages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code sections 204, 218.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

Second Cause of Action

Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages

(Against All Defendants)

90. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

91. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all overtime wages earned pursuant to Labor Code section 1194 and the Applicable Wage Order. Defendants caused Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work overtime hours but did not compensate them at one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for such hours in accordance with California law. Likewise, Defendants caused Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work double-time hours but did not compensate them at twice their regular rate of

1 pay for such hours in accordance with California law.

2 92. Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of California
3 law. This unlawful conduct includes but is not limited to Defendants' uniform and unlawful pay
4 policies and practices of failing to accurately record all the time that non-exempt employees were under
5 the supervision and control of Defendants. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and allow
6 Plaintiff and the other Class Members to recover in a civil action the unpaid amount of overtime
7 premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit
8 according to Labor Code section 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, the Applicable Wage Order, and Code of
9 Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

10 **Third Cause of Action**

11 *Failure to Provide Rest Periods and Pay Missed Rest Period Premiums*

12 *(Against All Defendants)*

13 93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

14 94. Section 12 of the Applicable Wage Order, and Labor Code section 226.7 establish the
15 right of employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten minutes for each four hour period
16 worked, or major fraction thereof. (See Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11140.)

17 95. Due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies and practices described in detail above,
18 Defendants did not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the other Class Members to take all rest periods
19 to which they were legally entitled. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants have not paid an
20 additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and the other Class Members at their respective regular rates of pay
21 for each violation, in accordance with California Labor Code section 226.7.

22 96. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the other
23 Class Members in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest
24 thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the Applicable Wage Order, and California
25 Labor Code section 226.7.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

2

3

4

5
6
7
8
9
0
1

2
3
4
5

6

7

8

9

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

5
67
8

1 Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been denied their legal right and protected interest in having
2 available at a central location at the plant or establishment where they are employed, accurate and
3 complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, employees at those
4 respective locations pursuant to Labor Code 1174.

5 **Sixth Cause of Action**

6 *Failure to Pay Wages Timely during Employment*

7 *(Against All Defendants)*

8 104. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

9 105. Labor Code section 200 provides that “wages” include all amounts for labor performed
10 by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
11 task, pieces, commission basis, or other method of calculation. Labor Code section 204 states that all
12 wages earned by any person in any employment are payable twice during the calendar month and must
13 be paid not more than seven days following the close of the period when the wages were earned. Labor
14 Code section 210, subdivision (a), makes employers who violate Labor Code section 204 subject to a
15 penalty of \$100 for any initial failure to timely pay each employee’s full wages and \$200 for each
16 subsequent violation, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld.

17 106. Labor Code section 216 establishes that it is a misdemeanor for any person, with regards
18 to wages due, to “falsely deny the amount or validity thereof, or that the same is due, with intent to
19 secure himself, his employer or other person, any discount upon such indebtedness, or with intent to
20 annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud, the person to whom such indebtedness is due.”

21 107. Defendants as a matter of established company policy and procedure in the State of
22 California, scheduled, required, suffered, and/or permitted Plaintiff and the other Class Members, to
23 work without full compensation, to work without legally-compliant off-duty meal periods, to work
24 without legally-compliant off-duty rest periods, and thereby failed to fully pay Plaintiff and the other
25 Class Members within seven days of the close of payroll, as required by law.

26 108. Defendants, as a matter of established company policy and procedure in the State of
27 California, falsely deny they owe Plaintiff and the other Class Members these wages, with the intent of
28 securing for itself a discount upon its indebtedness and/or to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay,

1 and/or defraud Plaintiff and the other Class Members.

2 109. Defendants' pattern, practice, and uniform administration of its corporate policy of
3 illegally denying employees compensation, as described herein, is unlawful and entitles Plaintiff and
4 the other Class Members to recover, pursuant to Labor Code section 218, the unpaid balance of the
5 compensation owed to them in a civil action and any applicable penalties, attorney fees, and interest
6 owed to them pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 and 218.5.

7 **Seventh Cause of Action**

8 *Failure to Pay All Wages Earned and Unpaid at Separation*

9 *(Against All Defendants)*

10 110. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

11 111. The actionable period for this cause of action is three years prior to the filing of this
12 complaint through the present, and ongoing until the violations are corrected or the class is certified.
13 (*Pineda v. Bank of America, N.A.* (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1389, 1395; *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Productions,*
14 *Inc.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1094, 1109; Code Civ. Proc., § 338, subd. (a).) Labor Code sections 201 and
15 202 of the California Labor Code require Defendants to pay all compensation due and owing to its
16 former employees (including the formerly-employed Class Members) during the actionable period for
17 this cause of action at or around the time that their employment is or was terminated, or ended.

18 112. Section 203 of the Labor Code provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
19 compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required by Sections 201 and 202, then the
20 employer is liable for penalties in the form of continued compensation up to thirty workdays.

21 113. Due to Defendants' faulty pay policies, those Class Members whose employment with
22 Defendants has concluded were not compensated for each and every hour worked at the appropriate
23 rate. Defendants have willfully failed to pay those formerly-employed Class Members whose sums
24 were certain at the time of termination within seventy-two hours of their resignation and have failed to
25 pay those sums for thirty days thereafter as required by Labor Code sections 201 through 203.

26 114. As a result, Defendants are liable to the formerly-employed Class Members for waiting
27 time penalties amounting to thirty days wages for the formerly-employed Class Members pursuant to
28 Labor Code section 203. (See, e.g., DLSE Manual, § 4.3.4 [failure to pay any sort of wages due upon

1 termination entitles an employee to recover waiting time penalties].)

2 **Eighth Cause of Action**

3 *Failure to Indemnify All Necessary Business Expenditures*

4 *(Against All Defendants)*

5 115. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

6 116. California Labor Code Section 2802 states that employers must “indemnify” an
7 employee for “all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of
8 the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.”
9 Likewise, Labor Code section 2804 states that “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made
10 by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article
11 shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is
12 entitled under the laws of this State.”

13 117. Here, Plaintiff and the other Class Members paid out of pocket for necessary business
14 expenditures incurred as a direct consequence and requirement of performing their job duties, including
15 the costs associated with their personal cell phone, personal vehicle, and tools they required to perform
16 their work. Despite knowing that Plaintiff and the other Class Members incurred these necessary
17 business expenses, and requiring Plaintiff and the other Class Members to use such items, Defendants
18 did not reimburse them.

19 118. Thus, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the cost of such
20 necessary business expenses, plus interest from the date each incurred such business expenses, plus
21 fees and costs. (Lab. Code, § 2802, subds. (b), (c).)

22 **Ninth Cause of Action**

23 *Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements*

24 *(Against All Defendants)*

25 119. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

26 120. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), obligates employers, semi-monthly or at the
27 time of each payment to furnish an itemized wage statement in writing showing:

28 (1) The gross wages earned;

- (2) The 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) The net wages earned;
- (6) The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- (7) The name of the 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 the employee.

121. As set forth above, Defendants issued and continues to issue wage statements to its non-exempt employees including Plaintiff and the other Class Members that are inadequate under Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a). By failing to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members properly as described above, Defendants failed to include required information on their wage statements, including, but not limited to, the gross wages earned, the net wages earned in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

122. Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), of the Labor Code was knowing and intentional. (Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (e)).

123. As a result of Defendants' issuance of inaccurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and the other Class Members in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiff and the other Class Members are each entitled to recover an initial penalty of \$50, and subsequent penalties of \$100, up to an amount not exceeding an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per Plaintiff and per each Class Member from Defendants pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), along with costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

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

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

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

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

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

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

2
3
4
5
6
7
8

8

128. Defendants affirmatively denied its employees the ability to take preventative cool-down rest in the shade when they felt the need to do so in order to protect themselves from overheating. In further violation, Defendants failed to monitor any of its employees during high-heat temperatures, and during high-heat temperatures failed to inquire if they were experiencing symptoms of heat illness (i.e. pale skin, heavy sweating, headache, muscle cramps and fatigue). Thus, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to an additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they were not provided with compliant recovery periods.

Eleventh Cause of Action

Violations of California's Unfair Competition Law

(Against All Defendants)

129. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

130. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200 through 17210, by committing the unlawful acts described above. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and unlawful business practices deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiff and the other Class Members of compensation to which they are legally entitled. These practices constitute unfair and unlawful competition and provide an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

131. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the Class Members, seeks full restitution of monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17208.

132. The acts complained of herein occurred within the four years prior to the initiation of this action and are continuing into the present and ongoing.

133. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this Court action to protect his interests and those of the Class Members, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf of Defendants' current non-exempt employees and to enforce important rights affecting the public

1 interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiff
2 is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

3 **VII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

4 134. Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury of Plaintiff's and the Class Members' claims
5 against Defendants.

6 **VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought
8 against Defendants, as follows:

- 9 1. For an order certifying the proposed class;
- 10 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the class;
- 11 3. For an order appointing Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the class;
- 12 4. For the failure to pay all minimum wages, compensatory, consequential, general, and
13 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2,
14 1197, and others as may be applicable;
- 15 5. For the failure to pay all overtime wages, compensatory, consequential, general, and
16 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194,
17 1198, and others as may be applicable;
- 18 6. For the failure to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums,
19 compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant
20 to Labor Code section 226.7;
- 21 7. For the failure to provide meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums,
22 compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant
23 to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512;
- 24 8. For the failure to maintain accurate employment records, penalties pursuant to Labor
25 Code sections 226.3, 1174.5, and others that may be applicable;
- 26 9. For the failure to pay wages timely during employment, the unpaid balance of the
27 compensation owed to Plaintiff and the other Class Members and any applicable
28 penalties owed to them pursuant to Labor Code section 210;

