

E-FILED
7/6/2022 4:15 PM
Clerk of Court
Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara
22CV399997
Reviewed By: R. Walker

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)
Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858)551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

22CV399997

MAURICIO VIDES, on behalf of the State
of California, as a private attorney general,

Case No. _____

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:

Plaintiff,

vs.

ALEXANDER'S STEAKHOUSE, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1 through
50, inclusive,

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code
§ 2699, *et seq.* for violations of Labor
Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210,
221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 351, 510, 512,
558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
2802, California Code of Regulations,
Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-
(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

Defendants.

1 Plaintiff Mauricio Vides (“PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of the people of the State of
2 California and as an “aggrieved employee” acting as a private attorney general under the Labor
3 Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) only, alleges on
4 information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal
5 knowledge, the following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against Defendant Alexander’s Steakhouse, Inc.
8 (referred to as “DEFENDANT”) seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties for himself, and
9 on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT.
10 PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by**
11 **California Labor Code § 2699**. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage
12 violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those
13 violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

14 2. California has enacted the PAGA to permit an individual to bring an action on
15 behalf of himself and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole
16 nature of this action.

17 3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for
18 DEFENDANT’s violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA – that
19 is, penalties and any other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to the PAGA. Nothing in this
20 complaint should be construed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in
21 a PAGA-only action.

22 **THE PARTIES**

23 4. Defendant Alexander’s Steakhouse, Inc. (“DEFENDANT”) is a corporation that
24 at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business
25 in the state of California.

26 5. DEFENDANT owns and operates restaurants in California.

27 6. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from October of 2021
28

1 to January 7, 2022 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee,
2 paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment
3 of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

4 7. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
5 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
6 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to
7 himself and all individuals who are or previously were employed DEFENDANT in California
8 and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time
9 period of March 10, 2021 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

10 8. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of himself and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently
11 or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative
12 action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT's
13 violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3,
14 351, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations,
15 Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon
16 the foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees
17 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

18 9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
19 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently
20 unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant
21 to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege
22 the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained.
23 PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that
24 the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
25 responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately
26 caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

27 10. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting
28 on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the

1 agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct
2 alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein.
3 Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and
4 all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
5 EMPLOYEES, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants'
6 agents, servants and/or employees.

7 8 THE CONDUCT

9 11. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
10 required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked,
11 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
12 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF
13 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they are
14 under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to
15 work while clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break.
16 PLAINTIFF is from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what
17 should be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
18 EMPLOYEES also worked off the clock with respect to time spent undergoing mandatory drug
19 testing or any other testing and/or examination required as a condition of employment.
20 DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers a uniform
21 practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
22 EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their
23 employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would
24 have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time.
25 Additionally, DEFENDANT engages in the practice of requiring PLAINTIFF and the
26 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work off the clock in that DEFENDANT, as a
27 condition of employment, required these employees to submit to mandatory temperature checks
28 and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior to clocking into DEFENDANT's

1 timekeeping system for the workday. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
2 EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks
3 by working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the
4 applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the
5 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
6 records.

7 12. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and rest break
8 premiums at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and the
9 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that is tied
10 to specific elements of an employee's performance.

11 13. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES'
12 compensation is DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF
13 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incentive wages based on their performance for
14 DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all employees paid on an
15 hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the various performance
16 goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate of pay in order to pay
17 overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
18 EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the
19 employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay and meal and rest
20 break premium pay. Management and supervisors described the incentive program to potential
21 and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive
22 compensation received by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be included
23 in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime
24 compensation and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
25 EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANT.

26 14. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
27 EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks
28 and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
2 for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
3 DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
4 EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees
5 were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged
6 in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and
7 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore
8 forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's
9 corporate policy and practice.

10 15. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
11 were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided
12 ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at
13 least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to
14 time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of
15 between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period
16 of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time.
17 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one hour wages
18 in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to
19 provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as
20 time during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer
21 control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers
22 authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve
23 employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which
24 includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers
25 cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out,
26 five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
27 EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which
28 states PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES cannot leave the work premises during

1 their rest period.

2 16. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay
3 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these
4 employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
5 DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all
6 time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an
7 employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work.
8 DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the
9 time they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have
10 known that PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were under compensated for all
11 time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited time
12 worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at
13 the applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off
14 the clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT fails to pay minimum
15 wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and
16 1197.1.

17 17. During the PAGA PERIOD, pursuant to DEFENDANT's company policies and
18 practices, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were forced to forfeit gratuities
19 left for them by customers to DEFENDANT's agents who provided no service to the customers
20 that resulted in the gratuity. DEFENDANT routinely added service charges to its food and
21 beverage banquet bills. These service charges were in the form of automatic charges which
22 customers are required to pay, and which reasonably appear to be gratuities for the service staff.
23 It is typical and customary in the hospitality industry that establishments impose gratuity charges
24 in the range of 18%-22% of the food and beverage bill. Thus, when customers have paid these
25 charges, it is reasonable for them to have believed they were gratuities to be paid to the service
26 staff. Indeed, because many of these charges are depicted to customers, and the custom in the
27 food and beverage industry that gratuities in the range of 18%-22% are paid for food and
28 beverage service, customers have paid these charges reasonably believing they were remitted

1 to the service staff. However, DEFENDANT has not remitted the total proceeds of these
2 gratuities to the non-managerial employees who serve the food and beverages. Instead,
3 DEFENDANT has a policy and practice of retaining for itself a portion of these gratuities
4 and/or using a portion of these gratuities to pay managers or other non-service employees. As
5 a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES have not received the total proceeds
6 of the gratuities, to which they are entitled to under California law.

7 18. DEFENDANT is generally in the business of owning and operating restaurants.
8 In addition, DEFENDANT also provides services to large groups, such as wedding parties and
9 other banquet events. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES were in the “chain of service” and earned gratuities based on their service for
11 their customers. However, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were forced to
12 forfeit portions of their gratuities, which said gratuities were kept by DEFENDANT and their
13 agents who were not in the chain of service from which the gratuity resulted. PLAINTIFF and
14 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES contend that any gratuities kept by DEFENDANT were illegal
15 and in violation of California law because PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES,
16 not DEFENDANT, provided the service for to whom the gratuity should have been paid.

17 19. California Labor Code § 351 establishes the requirements for an employer
18 regarding the payment of gratuities. Specifically, gratuities are the sole property of the
19 employees. California Labor Code § 351 expressly prohibits employers and their agents from
20 collecting, taking, or receiving any portion of a gratuity. California Labor Code § 350(e)
21 defines the term “gratuity” as including any money that has been paid or given or left for an
22 employee by a patron of a business over and above the actual amount due the business for
23 services rendered or for goods, food, drink or articles sold or served to such patron. Labor Code
24 § 353 requires employers to keep accurate records of all gratuities they receive, directly or
25 indirectly.

26 20. Although tip pooling is not expressly prohibited by the Labor Code, employees
27 who mandate tip pooling must only distribute pooled tips to employees in the “chain of service.”
28 By distributing tips to DEFENDANT directly and to their agents who were not in the “chain of

1 service,” DEFENDANT has violated and continues to violate the legal requirements for
2 handling pooled tips and violated the holding in *O’Grady v. Merchant Exchange Productions,*
3 *Inc.*, No. A148513 (Court of Appeals of California, First District, Division Two.)

4 21. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
5 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to
6 show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226
7 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate
8 itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all
9 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
10 worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on
11 an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during
12 the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages
13 were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements
14 DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify
15 such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total
16 hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added up,
17 they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab.
18 Code 226(a)(2). Additionally, DEFENDANT violates Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(8) by
19 failing to list the correct name of the legal entity that employed PLAINTIFF and the
20 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph,
21 DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the
22 requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time to
23 time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements which
24 violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

25 22. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be
26 deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the
27 wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period.
28 Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

1 [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in
2 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in
3 Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial
4 violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee; (2) For each
5 subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200)
6 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully
7 withheld.

8 23. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
9 EMPLOYEES within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll period in accordance with Cal.
10 Lab. Code § 204(d).

11 24. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
12 EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in violation of Cal. Lab.
13 Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt employees earn non-
14 discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT
15 underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of
16 pay.

17 25. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(1)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
18 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime
19 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days
20 of employment.

21 26. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay at
22 the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES routinely earned non-
23 discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay. However, when sick pay
24 was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
25 EMPLOYEES, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as required under Cal. Lab.
26 Code Section 246.

27 27. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF and
28 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time
penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is informed and believes
and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful, such that
PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose employment has separated are

1 entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

2 28. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer
3 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to
4 said employee." DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the
5 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, made unlawful deductions from compensation payable to
6 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, failed to disclose all aspects of the
7 deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES,
8 and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable pay period and upon
9 termination.

10 29. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
11 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by
12 the PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of discharging
13 their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers
14 are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their
15 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or
16 her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
17 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
18 the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions,
19 believed them to be unlawful."

20 30. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
21 EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal
22 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
23 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated
24 with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically,
25 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by DEFENDANT to use their
26 personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT,
27 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses
28 which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones

1 all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

2 31. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA
3 PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect
4 PLAINTIFF during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF seeks penalties for those violations that
5 affected the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.* 2018
6 AJDAR 12157 (Certified for Publication 12/19/18).

7 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8 32. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
9 Procedure, Section 410.10.

10 33. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
11 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
12 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and facilities
13 in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the
14 wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
15 EMPLOYEES.

16
17 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act**

19 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*]**

20 **(By PLAINTIFF and Against All Defendants)**

21 34. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set
22 forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

23 35. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
24 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of
25 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under
26 PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to
27 benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution,
28 but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the

1 Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the
2 public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover
3 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA
4 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

5 36. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
6 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
7 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
8 with respect to himself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by
9 DEFENDANT in California and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES") during the time period of March 10, 2021 until a date as determined by the
11 Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

12 37. On March 10, 2022, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the
13 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
14 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
15 Labor Code § 2699.3. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations
16 to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now
17 commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy
18 of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

19 38. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
20 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
21 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly
22 record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,
23 (d) failed to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for
24 required expenses, (f) failed to pay wages when due and (g) failed to provide gratuities, all
25 in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203,
26 204 *et seq.*, 210, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 351, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
27 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B),
28 and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such

1 conduct.¹ PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the
2 Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of
3 California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
4 EMPLOYEES.

5 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and
7 severally, as follows:

8 1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
9 EMPLOYEES:

10 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private
11 Attorneys General Act of 2004; and,

12 B) An award of attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the
13 law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

14 Dated: July 6, 2022 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
15

16 By: /s/ Nicholas De Blouw

17 Norman B. Blumenthal
18 Kyle R. Nordrehaug
19 Nicholas J. De Blouw

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ¹Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor
28 Code §558(a)(3).