

7/1
526

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Peter J. Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 295611]
peter@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
4590 Allstate Drive
Riverside, CA 92501
Tel: (951) 320-1444
Fax: (951) 320-1445

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

NOV 29 2021

BY *Chadame Johnson* DEPUTY

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

ARMANDO FLORES, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUNRISE RESPIRATORY CARE, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1 through
20, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: CIVSB 2127592
[Assigned to Hon. Judge David Cohn, Dept.
S26, for all purposes]

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINT**

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized
Wage Statements;
- (7) Unfair and Unlawful Competition;

PAGA CLAIMS

- (8) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (9) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (10) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (11) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (12) Failure to Timely Pay Wages;
- (13) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages; and
- (14) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized
Wage Statements.

Complaint Filed: September 27, 2021

By Fax

1 Plaintiff Armando Flores (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and
2 on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action against his former employer(s), Defendants Sunrise
5 Respiratory Care, Inc. and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively, “Defendants”) on behalf
6 of all current and former nonexempt employees employed by Defendants in California (the
7 “Class” or “Represented Employees”), for Labor Code violations stemming from Defendants’
8 failure to pay all wages owed, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to
9 provide meal periods, failure to provide rest breaks, failure to timely pay wages upon separation
10 of employment, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

11 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately June through
12 September 2021.

13 3. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Represented Employees were
14 subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations
15 to which Plaintiff was subjected during employment.

16 4. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
17 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
18 worked. As one such example, Defendants frequently failed to pay proper minimum, regular,
19 and overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees due to the practice of
20 automatically deducting 30 minutes from each shift, regardless of whether a meal period
21 occurred. To illustrate, Plaintiff often worked 9.5 hours without a meal period, and no meal
22 period was recorded in Defendants’ timekeeping system. Yet, on these and similar occasions,
23 Defendants only paid for 9 hours of work despite that no meal period was taken or recorded, and
24 without making any inquiry into whether a compliant meal period occurred. This resulted in a
25 failure to pay minimum/regular wages (since Plaintiff was not paid at all for those 30 minutes),
26 as well as a failure to pay overtime wages (since those 30 minutes were in excess of 8 hours and
27 had to be paid at the proper overtime rate). Thus, Defendants failed to pay proper minimum,
28 regular, and overtime wages every time it applied its auto-deduct practice.

1 5. Also, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were paid on
2 an hourly basis but were entitled to and did receive additional nondiscretionary compensation.
3 However, during workweeks where the Represented Employees worked overtime hours and
4 earned additional nondiscretionary compensation, Defendants failed to include that
5 compensation in the calculations for the regular rate of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5
6 times the base rate of pay – violating the well-established rule that overtime must always be paid
7 at time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

8 6. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were also denied 30-minute off-duty
9 meal periods, as mandated by California law. As a result of Defendants’ policies and practices,
10 the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable
11 to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal period while under the
12 control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4) forced to take a meal
13 period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided a mandated second meal period for shifts
14 in excess of 10 hours.

15 7. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Represented Employees with
16 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
17 mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the Represented
18 Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to being
19 overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the
20 Represented Employees worked longer shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit
21 mandated third or fourth rest breaks.

22 8. Plaintiff also alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
23 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
24 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
25 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
26 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
27 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, wage premiums, vacation wages, among others.

28 ///

1 9. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
2 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

3 10. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' violations of the wage and hour components of
4 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their
5 level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over
6 its competitors.

7 11. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
8 Represented Employees' employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees'
9 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
10 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
11 hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
12 underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

13 12. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, injunctive, equitable, and
14 monetary relief against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of himself and the Represented
15 Employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys' fees,
16 penalties, costs and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208,
17 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199,
18 among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the right to name
19 additional representatives throughout the State of California.

20 **II. JURISDICTION**

21 13. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the
22 Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

23 **III. VENUE**

24 14. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil
25 Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in San Bernardino County and the unlawful
26 acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in San
27 Bernardino County. Furthermore, Defendants employed or employ Plaintiff and Represented
28 Employees in San Bernardino County.

1 **IV. PARTIES**

2 **Plaintiff**

3 15. Plaintiff and Class Representative Armando Flores was employed by Defendants
4 from approximately June through September 2021 and performed work for Defendants in San
5 Bernardino County.

6 **Defendants**

7 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Sunrise
8 Respiratory Care, Inc. is a California Corporation authorized to and doing business in San
9 Bernardino County, California. Plaintiff is also informed and believes that Defendant Sunrise
10 Respiratory Care, Inc. is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Represented
11 Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

12 17. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of
13 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20,
14 inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for
15 the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Represented Employees by virtue of
16 Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious
17 names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE
18 Defendants when ascertained.

19 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he and the Represented
20 Employees worked under the joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and
21 each of them, acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants,
22 carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of
23 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a
24 unity of interest and ownership between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as
25 a single employer of Plaintiff and other Represented Employees.

26 19. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
27 Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single
28 employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human

resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally, Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor operations, and common ownership or financial control.

20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of their remaining co-Defendants.

21. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly, the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege, thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

22. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

23. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a class action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

24. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

///

1 25. The Class, also referred to as the “Represented Employees,” that Plaintiff seeks to
2 represent is defined as follows:

3 All current and former nonexempt employees employed by
4 Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.

5 26. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

6 **Meal Break Subclass**

7 All Represented Employees who worked a shift in excess of
8 5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

9 **Rest Break Subclass**

10 All Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least
11 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

12 **Waiting Time Penalties Subclass**

13 All Represented Employees who separated from their
14 employment with Defendants during the period three years
15 before the filing of this action and ending when final
16 judgment is entered.

17 **Wage Statement Penalties Subclass**

18 All Represented Employees during the period one year
19 before the filing of this action and ending when final
20 judgment is entered.

21 27. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class description with greater
22 specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues as appropriate.

23 28. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that he
24 seeks to represent.

25 29. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
26 under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the
27 litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable from Defendants’ records.

28 ///

1 30. **Numerosity:** The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that
2 a joinder of all Represented Employees is impracticable. Although the exact number is currently
3 unknown to Plaintiff, this information is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

4 31. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which
5 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including
6 without limitation:

7 i. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
8 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all
9 hours worked;

10 ii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
11 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
12 Employees for hours above 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week;

13 iii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
14 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Meal Break
15 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
16 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a compliant
17 meal period was not provided;

18 iv. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
19 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Rest Break
20 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass
21 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a paid rest
22 break was not provided;

23 v. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
24 timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment between Defendants and Plaintiff and
25 the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass, whether such separation was voluntary or involuntary;

26 vi. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
27 provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized
28 wage statements;

vii. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, and failure to timely pay final wages; and

viii. Whether Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

32. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims, as the Class Representative, are typical of the claims of The Class. Plaintiff, like other members of The Class, was subjected to Defendants' ongoing Labor Code and Wage Order violations including pertaining to the failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to provide mandated paid rest breaks, failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

33. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff, as the Class Representative, will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's interests are not in conflict with those of the Class. Class Representative's counsel are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions and other complex litigation matters, including cases like this case.

34. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

///

///

///

///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

4 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

5 35. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 36. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement
8 to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for
9 each hour worked.

10 37. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided proper minimum and
11 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
12 worked. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were
13 required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they
14 were performing.

15 38. As one such example, Defendants frequently failed to pay proper minimum and
16 regular wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees due to the practice of automatically
17 deducting 30 minutes from each shift, regardless of whether a meal period occurred.

18 39. To illustrate, Plaintiff often worked 9.5 hours without a meal period, and no meal
19 period was recorded in Defendants' timekeeping system. Yet, on these and similar occasions,
20 Defendants only paid for 9 hours of work despite that no meal period was taken or recorded, and
21 without making any inquiry into whether a compliant meal period occurred. This resulted in a
22 failure to pay minimum/regular wages (since Plaintiff was not paid at all for those 30 minutes).
23 As a result, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all hours
24 worked, including minimum and regular wages.

25 40. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
26 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
27 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

28 ///

41. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

42. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

43. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

44. During employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

45. As a result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

46. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of all unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1194.2, against Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants

47. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

48. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

1 49. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
2 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
3 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
4 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
5 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
6 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

7 50. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required by
8 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to
9 Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked Plaintiff and the
10 Represented Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

11 51. As one such example, Defendants frequently failed to pay proper overtime wages
12 to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees due to the practice of automatically deducting 30
13 minutes from each shift, regardless of whether a meal period occurred. To illustrate, Plaintiff
14 often worked 9.5 hours without a meal period, and no meal period was recorded in Defendants'
15 timekeeping system. Yet, on these and similar occasions, Defendants only paid for 9 hours of
16 work despite that no meal period was taken or recorded, and without making any inquiry into
17 whether a compliant meal period occurred. This resulted in a failure to pay overtime wages
18 (since those 30 minutes were in excess of 8 hours and had to be paid at the proper overtime rate).
19 Thus, Defendants failed to pay proper overtime wages every time it applied its auto-deduct
20 practice.

21 52. Also, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were paid on
22 an hourly basis but were entitled to and did receive additional nondiscretionary compensation.
23 However, during workweeks where the Represented Employees worked overtime hours and
24 earned additional nondiscretionary compensation, Defendants failed to include that
25 compensation in the calculations for the regular rate of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5
26 times the base rate of pay – violating the well-established rule that overtime must always be paid
27 at time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

28 ///

1 53. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
2 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees because
3 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
4 week without proper overtime compensation.

5 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
6 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
7 Represented Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

8 55. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
9 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid proper overtime wages throughout the statutory
10 period, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

11 56. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
12 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
13 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
14 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
15 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

16 57. During the employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
17 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

18 58. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
19 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

20 59. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
21 all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against
22 Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

23 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

25 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

26 *Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

27 60. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
28 as if fully alleged herein.

1 61. Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
2 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
3 periods.

4 62. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
5 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

6 63. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
7 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
8 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
9 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
10 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
11 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
12 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

13 64. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
14 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
15 pay for each meal period that is missed.

16 65. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were denied
17 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
18 practices, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations
19 when they were: (1) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty
20 meal period while under the control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period,
21 (4) forced to take a meal period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided a mandated
22 second meal period for shifts in excess of 10 hours.

23 66. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
24 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not provided with all
25 mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass one
26 additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

27 ///

28 ///

1 67. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Meal
2 Break Subclass all mandated meal periods and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
3 meal or rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

4 68. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass did not
5 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
6 obtained from Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not willfully obtained, were not
7 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
8 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
9 to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

10 69. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
11 periods as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of
12 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
13 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
14 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal period was not
15 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

16 70. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
17 and IWC Wage Order § 11, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Meal
18 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

19 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

21 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

22 *Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

23 71. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
24 as if fully alleged herein.

25 72. Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
26 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

27 73. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
28 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

1 74. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
2 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
3 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
4 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
5 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

6 75. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
7 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
8 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

9 76. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
10 Break Subclass with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
11 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the
12 Rest Break Subclass were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due
13 to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and
14 the Rest Break Subclass worked lengthy shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit
15 mandated third or fourth rest breaks.

16 77. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
17 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were not provided with all
18 mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
19 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

20 78. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
21 Break Subclass all mandated rest breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
22 rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

23 79. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with rest breaks
24 as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of each rest
25 break not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage
26 Order § 12. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at the
27 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a paid rest break was not
28 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

80. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage Order § 12, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass against All Defendants

81. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

82. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing and payment of wages.

83. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

84. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid, without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

85. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

86. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass were not paid all wages due and owing upon separation of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

87. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass upon separation of employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, overtime, and vacation wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums.

///

1 88. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
2 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass all
3 wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and
4 202. Consequently, pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendants owe Plaintiff and the Waiting
5 Time Penalties Subclass the above-described waiting time penalty, all in an amount to be shown
6 according to proof at trial and within the jurisdiction of this Court.

7 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

9 (Labor Code § 226)

10 *Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass against All Defendants*

11 89. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
12 as if fully alleged herein.

13 90. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
14 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
15 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

16 91. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
17 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
18 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
19 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
20 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
21 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

22 92. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
23 and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass due to violations including: failure to accurately state
24 total hours worked (the wage statements failed to accurately reflect total compensable hours due
25 to the illegal auto-deduct policy); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to
26 accurately state all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the
27 applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay); and failure to accurately
28 state the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

1 93. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
2 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a
3 wage statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
4 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

5 94. Defendants' failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the
6 Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the
7 calculation and rate of pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore,
8 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting
9 miscalculation of wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said
10 Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered
11 and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost
12 interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully
13 perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to
14 proof at trial.

15 95. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
16 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered an injury in
17 that each was prevented from knowing, understanding and disputing the wage payments paid to
18 them. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have each suffered an
19 injury in that the failure to show all wages earned on the itemized wage statements resulted in
20 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees being denied all necessary deductions, payments, and
21 withholdings owed by the employer, including, but not limited to, the failure to make all
22 necessary contributions for unemployment benefits, social security benefits, proper payment of
23 taxes and withholdings, and other mandated state and federal benefits.

24 96. Plaintiff has also been injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt
25 to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the
26 mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

27 97. Labor Code § 226(e) requires Defendants to pay the greater of all actual damages
28 or fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and

one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods, plus attorney's fees and costs, to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass who were injured by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a). The exact amount of the applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION

(Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*)

Plaintiff and the Represented Employees against All Defendants

98. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

99. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair competition, which includes any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." The Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact, due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

100. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under Business & Professions Code § 17021.

101. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California's wage and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide mandated meal periods and rest breaks, and failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, all to decrease their costs and increase their profits.

102. At all times relevant herein, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees wages and monies and other financial obligations to which they were entitled.

103. As a result of Defendants' failure to comply with the Labor Code and IWC Orders, Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, suffered a loss of wages and monies, all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. Defendants' ongoing violations of the foregoing statutes and laws constitute a violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*

104. Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders and its scheme to lower its payroll costs as alleged herein, constitute unlawful and unfair business

1 practices because it was done in a systematic manner over a period of time to the detriment of the
2 Plaintiff and all others similarly-situated.

3 105. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
4 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
5 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
6 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

7 106. A violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq. may be
8 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
9 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, are
10 unlawful and in violation of public policy, and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive,
11 fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
12 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

13 107. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has no plain,
14 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which they have suffered as a
15 consequence of Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of
16 the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
17 and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
18 harm unless Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
19 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

20 108. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is entitled to,
21 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge the profits which Defendants have
22 acquired, or of which Plaintiff and Represented Employees have been deprived, by means of the
23 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the
24 Represented Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the unfair
25 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

26 109. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
27 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
28 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining Defendants, and each of them, from

engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the future.

110. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Represented Employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

VI. LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CAUSES OF ACTION
(Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)

111. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as he was employed by Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil action filed on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved employees in California against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

112. Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys' fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Therefore, Plaintiff is not required to, nor does she, seek class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

113. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have elapsed since the date Plaintiff provided the written notice of the claims alleged herein without the LWDA assuming jurisdiction over the claims alleged. Accordingly, Plaintiff has fully satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit under the PAGA.

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 114. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 115. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to
8 be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each
9 hour worked.

10 116. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and
11 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
12 worked.

13 117. As one such example, Defendants frequently failed to pay proper minimum and
14 regular wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees due to the practice of automatically
15 deducting 30 minutes from each shift, regardless of whether a meal period occurred.

16 118. To illustrate, Plaintiff often worked 9.5 hours without a meal period, and no meal
17 period was recorded in Defendants' timekeeping system. Yet, on these and similar occasions,
18 Defendants only paid for 9 hours of work despite that no meal period was taken or recorded, and
19 without making any inquiry into whether a compliant meal period occurred. This resulted in a
20 failure to pay minimum/regular wages (since Plaintiff was not paid at all for those 30 minutes).
21 As a result, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours
22 worked, including minimum and regular wages.

23 119. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
24 were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known
25 they were performing.

26 120. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
27 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
28 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

1 121. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
2 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
3 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

4 122. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
5 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
6 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

7 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

9 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

10 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

11 123. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
12 as if fully alleged herein.

13 124. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did
14 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

15 125. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
16 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
17 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
18 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
19 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
20 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

21 126. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by
22 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to
23 Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked Plaintiff and the
24 Aggrieved Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

25 127. As one such example, Defendants frequently failed to pay proper overtime wages
26 to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees due to the practice of automatically deducting 30
27 minutes from each shift, regardless of whether a meal period occurred. To illustrate, Plaintiff
28 often worked 9.5 hours without a meal period, and no meal period was recorded in Defendants'

1 timekeeping system. Yet, on these and similar occasions, Defendants only paid for 9 hours of
2 work despite that no meal period was taken or recorded, and without making any inquiry into
3 whether a compliant meal period occurred. This resulted in a failure to pay overtime wages
4 (since those 30 minutes were in excess of 8 hours and had to be paid at the proper overtime rate).
5 Thus, Defendants failed to pay proper overtime wages every time it applied its auto-deduct
6 practice.

7 128. Also, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid on an
8 hourly basis but were entitled to and did receive additional nondiscretionary compensation.
9 However, during workweeks where the Aggrieved Employees worked overtime hours and
10 earned additional nondiscretionary compensation, Defendants failed to include that
11 compensation in the calculations for the regular rate of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5
12 times the base rate of pay – violating the well-established rule that overtime must always be paid
13 at time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

14 129. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
15 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because
16 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
17 week without proper overtime compensation.

18 130. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
19 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
20 Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

21 131. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
22 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
23 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

24 ///

25 ///

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

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS

(Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

132. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

133. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal periods.

134. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

135. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

136. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B), Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each meal period that is missed.

137. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were denied the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and practices, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal period while under the control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4) forced to take a meal period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided a mandated second meal period for shifts in excess of 10 hours.

1 138. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
2 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
3 all mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
4 one additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

5 139. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
6 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
7 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
8 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
9 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
10 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

11 140. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
12 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
13 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

14 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

16 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

17 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

18 141. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
19 as if fully alleged herein.

20 142. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
21 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

22 143. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
23 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

24 144. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
25 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
26 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
27 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
28 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

1 145. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
2 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
3 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

4 146. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the
5 Aggrieved Employees with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
6 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the
7 Aggrieved Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks
8 due to the lack of adequate staffing and coverage and being overwhelmed by their hectic
9 workload. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked
10 lengthy shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a mandated third and fourth rest
11 breaks.

12 147. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
13 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
14 all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
15 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

16 148. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
17 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
18 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

19 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

21 (Labor Code § 204)

22 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

23 149. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
24 as if fully alleged herein.

25 150. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were "nonexempt" employees
26 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the
27 timing of payment of wages each period.

28 ///

1 151. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
2 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
3 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
4 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
5 the following month.

6 152. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states “[t]he requirements of this section shall
7 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
8 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.”

9 153. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the
10 Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each period within the time required by
11 Labor Code § 204. Moreover, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
12 Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited to,
13 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums, within the
14 time specified by Labor Code § 204.

15 154. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
16 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
17 and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

18 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

20 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 and 256)

21 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

22 155. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
23 as if fully alleged herein.

24 156. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “non-exempt” employees
25 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
26 timing and payment of final wages.

27 157. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
28 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

1 158. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
2 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
3 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

4 159. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
5 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
6 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

7 160. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
8 Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not
9 limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums,
10 within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

11 161. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
12 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
13 due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

14 162. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
15 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
16 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

17 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

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

20 (Labor Code § 226)

21 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

22 163. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
23 as if fully alleged herein.

24 164. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
25 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of
26 accurate itemized wage statements.

27 165. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
28 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the

1 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
2 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
3 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
4 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

5 166. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
6 and the Aggrieved Employees because due to violations including: failure to accurately state
7 total hours worked (the wage statements failed to accurately reflect total compensable hours due
8 to the illegal auto-deduct policy); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to
9 accurately state all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the
10 applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay); and failure to accurately
11 state the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

12 167. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
13 to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants failed to provide a wage statement
14 to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees that complied with the requirements of Labor Code §
15 226(a).

16 168. As a result of the Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff seeks
17 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
18 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.
19 See *Raines v. Coastal Pacific Food Distributors, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 667, 675 ("Section
20 226.3 provides the civil penalty for failure to comply" with Labor Code § 226).

21 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and all others
23 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
24 follows:

- 25 1. As to the Eighth through Fourteenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all
26 applicable and available remedies under the PAGA;
- 27 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under the PAGA;
- 28 3. That the First through Seventh Causes of Action be certified as a class action;

- 1 4. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;
- 2 5. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;
- 3 6. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Seventh
- 4 Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and
- 5 Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
- 6 7. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by
- 7 law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;
- 8 8. For injunctive relief and/or restitution as provided by the Labor Code and
- 9 Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;
- 10 9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200,
- 11 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1198,
- 12 and 1199, among other sections inadvertently omitted;
- 13 10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
- 14 not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties according to proof, including interest
- 15 thereon;
- 16 11. For pre- and post-judgment interest; and
- 17 12. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

18 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby

20 demands a jury trial as to the First through Fourteenth Causes of Action pled herein.

21

22 Dated: November 29, 2021

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

23

24 BY:



25 Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
26 Peter J. Carlson, Esq.
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff
28