

Haig B. Kazandjian, Esq. Bar No. 278622
 haig@hbklawyers.com
 Cathy Gonzalez, Esq. Bar No. 310625
 cathy@hbklawyers.com
HAIG B. KAZANDJIAN LAWYERS, APC
 801 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 970
 Glendale, California 91203
 Telephone: 1-818-696-2306
 Facsimile: 1-818-696-2307

Attorneys for Plaintiff AMILKAR FRAUSTO
 individually and on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees

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

AMILKAR FRAUSTO, individually and on
 behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees;

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARCH TELECOM, INC., a California
 Corporation, and DOES 1 through 50,
 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 22PSCV00477

**COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT
 UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
 GENERAL ACT, CALIFORNIA LABOR
 CODE § 2698, ET SEQ.**

Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et
 seq. (California Labor Code Private Attorneys
 General Act of 2004)

Plaintiff AMILKAR FRAUSTO, (hereinafter referred to as “REPRESENTATIVE
 PLAINTIFF”) alleges as follows:

PARTIES

1. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is an individual who resides in California and
 was employed by ARCH TELECOM, INC., from on or about October 1, 2021 until on or about
 October 26, 2021.

2. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based on such
 information and belief, alleges that at all times mentioned herein, ARCH TELECOM, INC. is a
 California Corporation, licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of
 California.

1 3. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based on such
2 information and belief, alleges that DEFENDANT is a wireless network provider. Thus,
3 DEFENDANT is subject to the applicable California laws as alleged throughout this Complaint.

4 4. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is unaware of the true names and capacities,
5 whether corporate, individual, or otherwise, of DEFENDANTS named as DOES 1 through 100,
6 inclusive. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 474, REPRESENTATIVE
7 PLAINTIFF will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to state said DEFENDANTS' true
8 names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF
9 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that said fictitiously-named
10 DEFENDANTS are responsible in some manner for the injuries and damages to
11 REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as further
12 alleged herein.

13 5. The definition of "employer" for purposes of the California Labor Code includes
14 irregular working arrangements, and was specifically drafted in order to prevent evasion and
15 subterfuge of California's labor laws. To that end, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is
16 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that DEFENDANTS, including any as of now
17 unknown entities, must be classified as joint-employers for purposes of liability for civil
18 penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"). As such, DEFENDANTS are each
19 liable for civil penalties for violation of the California Labor Code as to REPRESENTATIVE
20 PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

21 6. The term "DEFENDANTS" used throughout this Complaint includes all named
22 DEFENDANTS whether corporate, individual, or otherwise, and all unnamed DEFENDANTS
23 whether corporate, individual, or otherwise, that are now unknown but are referred to throughout
24 this Complaint as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.

25 7. This is only a Private Attorney General Action Complaint, pursuant to California
26 Labor Code section 2699 et seq., on behalf of REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and all other
27 persons similarly situated who worked for DEFENDANTS in their California locations as non-
28

exempt, hourly employees (herein collectively identified as “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) for:

(i) failure to provide employment records in violation of Labor Code sections 226, 432, and 1198.5;

(ii) failure to pay overtime and double time in violation of Labor Code sections 510 and the applicable Wage Orders;

(iii) failure to provide rest and meal periods in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), and the applicable Wage Orders;

(iv) failure to pay minimum wage in violation of Labor Code sections 1182.2, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and the applicable Wage Orders;

(v) failure to keep accurate payroll records and provide itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 1198, and the applicable Wage Orders;

(vi) failure to pay reporting time wages in violation of California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11050(5)(A);

(vii) failure to pay split shift wages in violation of California Code of Regulations 11050(4)(C);

(viii) failure to pay all wages earned on time in violation of Labor Code section 204;

(ix) failure to pay all wages earned upon discharge or resignation in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203;

(x) failure to reimburse necessary, business-related expenses in violation of Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

(xi) employers, and individuals acting on behalf of employers, violating or causing to be violated a section of the Labor Code or any Wage Order in violation of Labor Code section 558(a).

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

8. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 395 and under California Government Code section 12965(b), in that DEFENDANTS conduct business within the County of Los Angeles and each Defendant

1 is within the jurisdiction of this Court for service of process, REPRESENTATIVE
2 PLAINTIFFS' injuries were incurred within the County of Los Angeles, the actions giving rise
3 to REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFFS' Complaint arose within the County of Los Angeles, and
4 DEFENDANTS are located in the County of Los Angeles.

5 9. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based thereon
6 alleges, that no federal question is raised and that the Class Action Fairness Act ("CAFA"), 28
7 U.S.C. Section 1322(d) does not apply, or in the alternative that exceptions for local cases or
8 controversies under the CAFA do apply and prohibit removal of the action to federal Court.

9 10. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based thereon
10 alleges, that based on the total number of pay periods REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF
11 worked, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF's individual claims do not arise to the necessary
12 amount in controversy so as to implicate traditional jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 1322(a) or
13 jurisdiction under the CAFA.

14 11. Further, as a representative action under the PAGA, the matter is not subject to
15 removal under 28 U.S.C. Sections 1322(a)-(d). PAGA civil penalty actions are not subject to
16 federal jurisdiction.

17 12. This Court has jurisdiction over REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFFS' claims for
18 civil penalties under the PAGA, California Labor Code sections 2698 *et seq.*

19 SCOPE

20 13. The "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES" are DEFENDANTS' current and former
21 hourly-paid, non-exempt employees, who either were or are employed in the State of California
22 from February 18, 2021 through the date of judgment in this action.

23 STATEMENT OF FACTS

24 14. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF was hired by DEFENDANTS with the job title
25 of Sales Manager on or about October 1, 2021. DEFENDANT ARCH TELECHOM, INC. is a
26 California Corporation that operates as a wireless network provider. REPRESENTATIVE
27 PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANT up until on or about October 26, 2021.

28 15. While employed with DEFENDANT, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and

other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF seeks to represent in this action, working as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees were regularly misclassified as exempt employees and required to work off-the-clock, and/or during their rest and/or meal periods.

16. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF filed a PAGA Notice on February 18, 2022 by serving a PAGA Notice to all named DEFENDANTS and to the LWDA in compliance with Labor Code section 2699.3. As of April 25, 2021, 65 Days after REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF's PAGA Notice, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF has not received correspondence from the LWDA regarding its intent to investigate PLAINTIFF's claims.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT RECORDS

17. California Labor Code Section 226 provides, "An employer who receives a written or oral request to inspect or copy records pursuant to subdivision (b) pertaining to a current or former employee [records of hours worked and wages paid]...shall comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request."

18. California Labor Code Section 432 provides, "If an employee signs any instrument relating to the obtaining or holding of employment, he shall be given a copy of the instrument upon request."

19. California Labor Code Section 1198.5 provides that every employee shall be permitted to inspect and obtain a copy of their personnel records upon request.

20. In accordance with the process set out in Labor Code Section 226, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF requested, in writing by letter via certified first-class mail to DEFENDANT and regular first-class mail to DEFENDANT, that DEFENDANTS provide REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF with wage and payroll history, all documents signed by REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF pursuant to Labor Code Section 432, and a copy of REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF's personnel records pursuant to Labor Code Section 1198.5.

21. The time periods provided to DEFENDANT by Labor Code Sections 226, 432, 1198.5 and any other relevant statutes have elapsed since DEFENDANT received REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF's correspondence requesting documents pursuant to Labor

Code Sections 226, 432, and 1198.5, and a copy of REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF's personnel records pursuant to Labor Code Section 1198.5.

22. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT failed to provide records in compliance with Labor Code Sections 226, 432, and 1198.5 to other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in response to their requests.

OVERTIME / DOUBLE TIME

23. California Labor Code sections 510 and the applicable Wage Orders require employers to pay employees working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than 40 hours in a week at the rate of at least time-and-one-half (1.5) times their regular rate of pay ("overtime") for time such worked, and two (2) times their regular rate of pay ("double time") for such hours worked in excess of 12 hours in a day. "Regular rate" includes all remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses and incentives.

24. During the relevant time period, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES regularly worked in excess of eight (8), and in excess of 12, hours in a workday and/or 40 hours in a workweek.

25. The California Supreme Court opinion in *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* holds that, similar to the requirement that employers pay overtime at the "regular rate of pay" (which includes commissions, bonuses or other nondiscretionary pay), employers are required to pay meal and rest break premiums at a regular rate that includes commissions, bonuses or other non-discretionary pay. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFFS allege that DEFENDANTS failed to include the non-discretionary bonuses in its calculations for overtime penalties.

26. DEFENDANT routinely required REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work tasks before and/or after their scheduled shifts, and/or during off-the-clock meal breaks, and/or during rest breaks. As a consequence, DEFENDANT willfully failed to pay REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all of the wages to which they were entitled.

//

//

MEAL / REST BREAKS

27. California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), and the applicable Wage Orders require employers to pay employees one (1) additional hour of pay at the employees' regular rate for each work day that a legally compliant meal and/or rest break was not provided. Employers cannot require, cause, or permit an employee to work more than five (5) hours per day without providing an uninterrupted meal break. If an employee works over ten (10) hours in a workday, employers are required to either provide a second, uninterrupted 30-minute meal break or pay employees an additional one (1) hour of pay at the employees' regular rate. If the employer fails to properly record a valid meal period, it is presumed that no meal period was provided. Furthermore, no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period. Rest periods requirements are based on the total hours worked; employees are legally entitled to ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, that employee worked.

28. The California Supreme Court opinion in *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* holds that, similar to the requirement that employers pay overtime at the "regular rate of pay" (which includes commissions, bonuses or other nondiscretionary pay), employers are required to pay meal and rest break premiums at a regular rate that includes commissions, bonuses or other non-discretionary pay. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFFS allege that DEFENDANTS failed to include the non-discretionary bonuses in its calculations for meal and/or rest period penalties.

29. DEFENDANT failed to provide REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with the required rest and meal break periods. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were routinely required to work through these periods instead, because of understaffing, inadequate coverage, unreasonably high workload and expectations, and/or other actions, inactions, or decisions made by and within the sole control and discretion of DEFENDANT.

30. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked shifts in excess of five (5) hours without a meal break, and worked shifts of ten (10) hours or more without a second meal break, due to understaffing, inadequate coverage,

unreasonably high workload and expectations, and/or other actions, inactions, or decisions made by and within the sole control and discretion of DEFENDANT.

31. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that any purported appearance of meal and rest break compliance is because DEFENDANT systematically and routinely clocked out for and/or otherwise altered the timekeeping records of REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in an attempt to hide the aforementioned infractions. DEFENDANT, knowingly and contrary to law and public policy, employed a tactic of clocking-out employees for rest and/or meal periods that were never taken and/or were legally non-compliant, and/or otherwise falsified or altered timekeeping records.

32. DEFENDANT knew, or should have known, that their behavior caused REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work through the above-described meal and/or rest periods. As a company-wide policy, DEFENDANT still chose not to pay meal and rest period premiums required by law.

MINIMUM WAGE

33. California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 require employers to pay the minimum wage as set by the IWC. California Labor Code section 1182.12, as amended by Senate Bill 3, Chapter 4, Section 3, defines the minimum wage as;

(1) For any employer who employs 26 or more employees:

(A) From January 1, 2017, to December 31, 2017, \$10.50 per hour.

(B) From January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2018, \$11 per hour.

(C) From January 1, 2019, to December 31, 2019, \$12 per hour.

(D) From January 1, 2020, to December 31, 2020, \$13 per hour.

(E) From January 1, 2021, to December 31, 2021, \$14 per hour.

(F) From January 1, 2022, and until adjusted by subdivision (c) \$15 per hour.

(2) For any employer who employs 25 or fewer employees:

(A) From January 1, 2018, to December 31, 2018, \$10.50 per hour.

(B) From January 1, 2019, to December 31, 2019, \$11 per hour.

(C) From January 1, 2020, to December 31, 2020, \$12 per hour.

(D) From January 1, 2021, to December 31, 2021, \$13 per hour.

(E) From January 1, 2022, to December 31, 2022, \$14 per hour.

(F) From January 1, 2023, and until adjusted by subdivision (c) \$15 per hour.

34. The minimum wage standard applies to each hour employees worked for which they were not paid. Therefore, employer's failure to pay for any particular hour worked by an employee is unlawful even if averaging an employee's total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above minimum wage.

35. As alleged throughout this Complaint, due to the company-wide failures of DEFENDANT, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were forced to work off-the-clock before and/or after their scheduled work shifts, and/or during rest breaks, and/or during meal breaks. DEFENDANT failed to pay REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES minimum wage for this time and/or falsified timekeeping records to hide this fact.

ACCURATE/ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

36. California Labor Code 226(a) requires employers to create and provide to employees true and accurate employment records. California Labor Code section 226(e) provides that if an employer fails to furnish an employee with same, the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages, or \$50.00 for an initial infraction, and \$100 per employee for each subsequent violation in any pay period. California Labor Code 226.3 imposes civil penalties on any employer in violation of section 226(a) at \$250 per employee violation in an initial citation, and \$1,000 per employee for each subsequent violation.

37. California Labor Code 1174(d) requires employers to keep payroll records showing hours worked, and wages paid to and/or number of piece-rate units earned, for all employees. California Labor Code section 1174.5 subjects employers to a \$500 penalty for failing to maintain same.

38. California Labor Code section 1198 provides that maximum hours and standard conditions of labor are fixed by the Labor Commissioner in the applicable Wage Orders.

Pursuant to the applicable Wage Order, employers must keep accurate records of when employees begin and end each work period and each meal period.

39. DEFENDANT knowingly provided employees with records that do not meet the statutory requirements of truth and accuracy, because DEFENDANT failed to truthfully and accurately document, among other things, employees off-the-clock work. As a result, DEFENDANT failed to accurately list the correct amount of gross and/or net wages earned by REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

40. The statements in question are deficient in many other ways, including, but not limited to: failure to list total hours worked, failing to list applicable hourly rates and the numbers of hours worked at each rate, failure to list piece-rate units earned and the applicable piece-rate, failure to list deductions, failure to track sick leave, failure to list the employee and SSN/EID properly, failure to list the full legal name and address of the employer, failure to list inclusive dates for which employees are paid, failure to provide employees with the ability to easily access wage statements and get hard copies at no expense to the employee, and/or failure to state all hours worked as a result of off-the-clock work.

41. DEFENDANT willfully failed to maintain accurate payroll records for REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as a result of DEFENDANT'S failure to accurately record employees rest breaks, and/or meal breaks, and/or off-the-clock work. DEFENDANT'S failure makes it impossible for REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to accurately determine the extent of their underpayment, thereby causing further injuries to each of them.

REPORTING TIME

42. California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11050(5)(A) provides that for each workday when an employee is required to and does in fact report to work, but is either not put to work or is furnished less than half of said employee's usual scheduled day's work, that employee should be paid for no less than half, and in no event less than two (2) hours, of the employees' regular rate of pay.

43. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were

frequently told by DEFENDANT to report to work and were either not put to work or were furnished less than half of said employee's usual scheduled day's work. DEFENDANT routinely failed to pay the required reporting time wages to REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for each of these instances.

SPLIT SHIFTS

44. California Code of Regulations 11050(4)(C) provides that when an employee works a "split shift", one (1) hour's pay at the State or local minimum wage (whichever is greater) must be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday. A "split shift" is defined as a work schedule which is interrupted by non-paid, non-working periods established by the employer, other than *bona fide* rest or meal periods.

45. DEFENDANT routinely scheduled REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for multiple different shifts throughout the same workday, separated by periods other than *bona fide* rest or meal breaks. DEFENDANT failed to pay REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES one (1) hour's pay at the applicable minimum wage, which resulted in REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES being paid less than the applicable minimum wage for that day. As a further consequence, DEFENDANT also failed to separately list "split shift" payments on REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wage statements.

ALL WAGES PAID ON TIME

46. California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned, other than those due upon termination, be paid on time as defined by the statute.

47. As a result of the numerous company-wide failures of DEFENDANT as described throughout this Complaint, DEFENDANT failed to pay REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages due to them, including, but not limited to minimum wages, overtime wages, double time wages, split shift pay and/or reporting time pay, within the statutorily required time period.

//

//

1 **ALL WAGES PAID ON DISCHARGE / TERMINATION**

2 48. California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 provide that employees who are
3 terminated are due all wages earned immediately. Employees who resign their employment
4 without giving 72-hours' notice are due all wages earned within 72 hours of their resignation.
5 Employees who resign their employment giving 72-hours' notice are entitled to all wages earned
6 at the time their resignation becomes effective.

7 49. DEFENDANT terminated their employment relationship with
8 REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF on October 26, 2021. Accordingly, EMPLOYEE was due all
9 wages earned immediately.

10 50. When REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF finally received EMPLOYEE's final
11 paycheck, that final paycheck was legally deficient in that it did not account for all wages earned
12 despite DEFENDANT knowing that such wages were due to REPRESENTATIVE
13 PLAINTIFF. Due to the company-wide failures of DEFENDANT as described throughout this
14 Complaint, DEFENDANT similarly failed to pay other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES timely
15 wages upon their discharge or resignation.

16 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE**

17 51. California Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802 require that an employer
18 indemnify employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
19 consequence of the discharge of their duties.

20 52. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were
21 directed and expected to incur personal expenses on behalf of DEFENDANT while performing
22 their job duties. Such personal expenses include, but are not limited to, use of personal cell
23 phone, travel expenses, and parking expenses. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and the other
24 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would not have been able to successfully accomplish their job
25 duties absent incurring these personal expenses. DEFENDANT failed to indemnify
26 REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all necessary
27 expenditures or losses accordingly.

28 //

1 **CIVIL PENALTIES AND INDIVIDUAL LIABILITY**

2 53. California Labor Code section 558(a) provides that any employer, including
3 individuals acting on behalf of employers, that violates, or causes to be violated, a section of the
4 Labor Code or any applicable Wage Orders are subject to the following penalties;

- 5 • \$50 for any initial violation for each underpaid employee for each pay period for
6 which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover
7 unpaid wages;
8 • \$100 for each subsequent violation for each underpaid employee for each pay period
9 for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount to recover unpaid
10 wages;

11 54. Labor Code section 558.1 permits joint and several liability as to both an
12 individual and employer for violations of Labor Code sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1194, and 2802.
13 Labor Code section 558(c) provides that the penalties in this section are in addition to any other
14 civil penalty.

15 55. DEFENDANTS are employers, and violated REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF
16 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' rights by violating, or causing to be violated, various
17 sections of this code as described throughout this Complaint.

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2698, ET SEQ.)**

20 **(By REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF Against DEFENDANTS and Does 1 through 10,**
21 **inclusive)**

22 56. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF incorporates by reference the allegations
23 contained in each of the preceding paragraphs and each and every part thereof with the same
24 force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

25 57. PAGA expressly establishes that any provisions of the California Labor Code
26 which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its
27 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the
28 California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved

employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

58. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

59. REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees, are "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES" within the meaning of California Labor Code section 2699(c) as they are all current or former employees of DEFENDANT, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

Failure to Provide Employment Records

60. DEFENDANTS failure to provide REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with employment records constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity and is prohibited by California Labor Code 226, 432, and 1198.5.

Failure to Pay Overtime / Double Time

61. DEFENDANT'S failure to pay legally required overtime and double time wages to REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

Failure to Provide Meal and Rest Periods

62. DEFENDANT'S failure to provide legally required meal and rest periods to REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), and the applicable Wage Orders.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

63. DEFENDANT'S failure to pay legally required minimum wages to REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and the applicable Wage Orders.

Failure to Keep Accurate and Provide Itemized Wage Statements

64. DEFENDANT’S failure to keep accurate and provide itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226(a), 1174(d), and 1198.

Failure to Pay Reporting Time

65. DEFENDANT’S failure to pay REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who were required to and did in fact report to work, but who were then furnished less than half of such employees usual scheduled day’s work, with at least half, and in no event less than two (2) hours, of the employees’ regular rate of pay constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Code of Regulations 11050 (5)(A).

Failure to Pay “Split Shift” Premiums

66. DEFENDANT’S failure to pay REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES one (1) hour’s pay at the minimum wage in addition to the wages for that workday for any workday in which REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were scheduled for and required to work a “split shift” constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code 1198 and California Code of Regulations 11050(4)(C).

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

67. DEFENDANT’S failure to timely pay wages to REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES during their employment constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 204.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

68. DEFENDANT’S failure to timely pay wages to REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES upon termination constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

69. DEFENDANT’S failure to reimburse REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for necessary business-related expenses and costs

constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

Civil Penalties

70. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF, individually, and on behalf of all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, requests and is entitled to recover penalties from DEFENDANTS and each of them, for violations of the Labor Code as more fully described herein according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, including but not limited to:

a. Penalties under California Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11010, et seq. in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

c. Penalties under California Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalties provided in the California Labor Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation; and

d. Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes, including, but not limited to, penalties pursuant to California Labor Code 558(a).

71. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five percent (25%) to the

AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

72. Further, **REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF** is entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5 and 2699 and any other applicable statute.

THEREFORE, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF and the individuals he seeks to represent request relief as described below:

PRAYER

THEREFORE, REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS, and Does 1 through 100, and each of them, as follows:

1. Statutory attorneys' fees and costs under PAGA and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5;
2. Statutory penalties under PAGA;
3. Costs of suit; and
4. Such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: May 19, 2022

HAIG B. KAZANDJIAN LAWYERS, APC

By: /s/ Haig Kazandjian
Haig B. Kazandjian, Esq.,
Cathy Gonzalez, Esq.,
Attorneys for Plaintiff