

Eric K. Yaeckel [CSB No. 274608]
yaeckel@sullivanlawgroupapc.com
Ryan T. Kuhn [CSB No. 339223]
ryan@sullivanlawgroupapc.com

SULLIVAN & YAECKEL LAW GROUP, APC
2330 Third Avenue
San Diego, California 92101
(619) 702-6760 * (619) 702-6761 FAX

Attorneys for Plaintiff DOUGLAS HILL, Individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

DOUGLAS HILL, Individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated

Plaintiff

v.

GRAND RESTAURANT GROUP, a Nevada
Corporation, GRAND RESTAURANT
GROUP, INC., a Suspended California
Corporation, and DOES 1-10, inclusive

Defendants

CASE NO. 37-2022-00022886-CU-OE-CTL
(Proposed CLASS ACTION)

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR:

1. **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§
226.7 and 512 (Class Claim)**
2. **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§
510, 1194 and 1197 (Class Claim);**
3. **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §
226 (Class Claim)**
4. **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§
2802 (Class Claim)**
5. **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§
201-203 (Class Claim)**
6. **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND
PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 et
seq. (Class Claim)**
7. **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT OF 2004 (Representative Claim)**

Demand for Jury Trial.

COMES NOW Plaintiff DOUGLAS HILL ("HILL"), individually, and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and alleges for his First Amended Complaint as follows:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter in that all parties are residents of, or do business within, the State of California and the amount in controversy exceeds the statutory minimum limit of this Court. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. Furthermore, there is no federal question at issue as Wage and Hour protections and remedies related thereto are based solely on California Law and Statutes, including the Labor Code, Civil Code, and IWC Wage Order(s).
2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendant GRAND RESTAURANT GROUP, was and is a Nevada Corporation doing business throughout the state, including the County of San Diego, State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendant GRAND RESTAURANT GROUP, INC., was and is a California Corporation, suspended under the California Secretary of State's Office, doing business throughout the state of California, including the County of San Diego, state of California.
3. Venue before this Court is proper in that Defendant GRAND RESTAURANT GROUP and GRAND RESTAURANT GROUP, INC., (hereinafter "Defendants") were and are performing business in the state of California, and county of San Diego. Additionally, certain acts constituting the below violations were committed in the county of San Diego. Defendants, and each of them, were each Plaintiff's employers, as evidenced by (among other facts), certain admissions by the Defendants, as well as certain rules, restrictions, benefits and compensation services provided by Defendants, to the Plaintiff and each alleged Class Member.
4. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff HILL was and is an individual working in the county of San Diego, state of California.
5. Plaintiff is presently unaware of the true names, capacities and liability of Defendants named

1 herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive. Accordingly, Plaintiff will seek leave of court to
2 amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities after the same have been
3 ascertained.

- 4 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named
5 Defendants are responsible in some manner for the wrongs and damages as herein alleged, and
6 in so acting was functioning as the agent, servant, partner, and employee of the co-defendants,
7 and in doing the actions mentioned below, was acting within the course and scope of his or her
8 authority as such agent, servant, partner, and employee with the permission and consent of the
9 co-defendants. Plaintiff's injuries as herein alleged were proximately caused by said
10 Defendants. Wherever it is alleged herein that any act or omission was done or committed by
11 any specially named Defendant or Defendants, Plaintiff intends thereby to allege and does
12 allege that the same act or omission was also done and committed by each and every Defendant
13 named as a DOE, both separately and in concert or conspiracy with the named Defendant or
14 Defendants.
- 15 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them,
16 including DOES 1 through 10, are and at all times herein mentioned were either individuals,
17 sole proprietorships, partnerships, registered professionals, corporations, alter egos or other
18 legal entities which were licensed to do and/or were doing business in the county of San Diego,
19 state of California at all times relevant to the subject matter of this action.

20 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

- 21 8. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee, from approximately
22 November 2020 through the current date. Throughout his employment with Defendants,
23 Plaintiff performed his job in a capable and competent manner, and was commended for doing
24 so.
- 25 9. Throughout the term of his employment, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were and
26 currently are denied the benefits and protections of the Labor Code due to Defendants'
27 institutionalized pay practices, standard as to all of Defendants' California-based, nonexempt,
28 non-union employees.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

10. As more specifically set forth below, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of an ascertainable class and a well-defined community of interest among the class members. Code Civ. Proc. § 382; *Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.* (1981) 29 Cal.3d 426, 470. Throughout the operative limitations period, that is June 14, 2018 until the completion of this action, Plaintiff and all other class members were denied the protections and benefits of the Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order(s) due to Defendants' standard practices. Throughout their employment, Plaintiff and all other class members were and are denied full and accurate compensation, including overtime compensation, in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 510 and 1194. Plaintiff and the other class members were and are denied legally-compliant Meal and Rest Periods and Meal and Rest Period payments, in violation of, *inter alia*, IWC Wage Order 5 (or any other applicable Wage Order) and Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512. Defendants failed to furnish accurate itemized wage statements in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code section 226. Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other class members for necessary business expenditures in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code section 2802.
11. Plaintiff brings this action on the grounds that he and other similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants were and are improperly denied the mandated wages and reimbursements resulting from the above-referenced violations. *Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319. The class is believed to contain approximately Two Hundred (200) members.
12. The approximately Two Hundred (200) member class is ascertainable via their experience as Defendants' current or former California-based employees, designated as "nonexempt" by Defendants.
13. Class members share a community of interest and an injury-in-fact as Defendants have violated California compensation laws, depriving class members of money earned.
14. There are questions of fact and law common to the class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual members. The questions of law and fact common to the class arising

1 from Defendants' actions include, without limitation, the following:

- 2 a. Whether Defendants failed to pay its employees the proper straight-time, overtime, and
3 double time wages due and owing to them;
- 4 b. Whether Defendants failed to provide its employees with statutorily-compliant Meal
5 and/or Rest Periods, in violation of, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 512 and
6 226.7, in that Defendants written policies are not compliant with California law,
7 Defendants do not allow its employees timely and duty-free breaks, and Defendants
8 improperly "alter" employees recorded Meal Periods to avoid Meal Penalty payments;
- 9 c. Whether Defendants failed to properly provide Meal and Rest Period premiums in
10 accordance with law;
- 11 d. Whether Defendants failed to properly calculate and pay its employees overtime
12 compensation or Meal and Rest Period premiums in accordance with law by failing to
13 properly calculate, into the Regular Rate of Pay, the value of employee benefits;
- 14 e. Whether Defendants failed to properly reimburse its employees for necessary business
15 expenditures for, *inter alia*, cell phone costs and mileage, in violation of Labor Code
16 section 2802;
- 17 f. Whether Defendants failed to provide all compensation upon termination of
18 employment in violation of Labor Code sections 201-203, due, in part, to the fact that
19 Defendants failed to provide proper compensation for all hours worked, as discussed
20 above; and
- 21 g. Whether Defendants conduct constituted a violation of Business & Professions Code
22 section 17200 *et seq.*

- 23 15. The class on whose behalf this action is brought is so numerous that joinder of all parties
24 individually would be impracticable. Plaintiff brings the class action on behalf of
25 approximately Two Hundred (200), California-based current and former employees of
26 Defendants who share a common or general interest, and it would be impracticable for those
27 employees to bring the action individually. Any variations in job activities between the
28 individual class members are legally insignificant to the issues presented by this action since

1 the central facts remain, to wit, Plaintiff and all other class members were improperly denied
2 the benefits and protections of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order(s), by and through
3 Defendants' standard and institutionalized practices.

4 16. There are questions of law and fact common to the class. Plaintiff, and all class members, were
5 injured by Defendants' violations of the enumerated Labor Code sections and IWC Wage
6 Order(s). As these violations resulted from Defendants' standard and institutionalized
7 practices, questions of law and fact are common to the class.

8 17. Plaintiff's claims in this action are typical of the class whom Plaintiff generally represents.
9 The claims result from Defendants' standard and institutionalized practices, experienced by
10 Plaintiff and all other class members.

11 18. Plaintiff can fairly and adequately protect the interests of all the members of the class he
12 represents in this action. Any difference in job titles is immaterial, as Defendants used (and
13 uses) standard systems to compensate class members. Plaintiff's experience and knowledge
14 of Defendants' "wage and hour" practices, in addition to Plaintiff's familiarity with Defendants
15 pay policies pertaining to the class members he represents, entitles him to adequately and fairly
16 represent the class.

17 19. Common questions predominate over questions affecting individual class members. Plaintiff
18 and all other class members were improperly denied the benefits and protections of the Labor
19 Code and IWC Wage Order(s) by and through Defendants' standard and institutionalized
20 practices. Common questions of law or fact therefore "present a significant aspect of the case"
21 and are capable of resolution "in a single adjudication." *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.* (9th Cir.
22 1998) 150 F.3d 1011, 1022.

23 20. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants are and were "employers" as that term is used
24 within the relevant sections of the California Labor Code.

25 ///

26
27 ///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
Meal and Rest Period Violations Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512
Class Action
(Individually, and on behalf of the Class against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)

21. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 20 as though fully set forth herein.

22. Labor Code section 1198 states:

The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

Defendants violated this section by establishing working conditions below the standard of the applicable Wage Order.

23. Under applicable California law, "An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes [...] An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes" Lab. Code § 512(a); see also 8 Cal. Code Regulations. § 11050 (11)(A). Unless the employee is relieved of all duty for a full thirty (30) minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. 8 Cal. Code Regulations. § 11050 (11); See *Safeway v. Superior Court* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1138, 1160.

24. California law requires employers to provide employees with a 10-minute rest break for every four hours worked, or "major fraction thereof." 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 11050 (12).

25. An employer who fails to provide meal or rest periods as required by an applicable Wage Order must pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that the meal or rest period was not provided. Lab. Code § 226.7(b); 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 11050 (11), (12).

26. Within the operative time period, Defendants failed to possess compliant Meal and Rest Period policies.

27. For example, Defendants' Rest Period policy and practice does not provide the right for

- 1 employees to "leave the premises," and actually require the employees to "remain on premises
2 for the duration of this Rest Period" where "coverage" issues require as such.
- 3 28. Defendants' Meal and Rest Period policy also assumes that employees have "waived" the right
4 to a legally-compliant Meal or Rest Period, or a Meal or Rest Period penalty payment, unless
5 the employees complete a very specific process of formal notification to the Defendants.
- 6 29. Moreover, Defendants policies and practices preclude "duty-free" Meal and Rest Periods.
7 These institutional and established practices of Defendants are illegal, in that Plaintiff and all
8 other employees were denied proper and/or timely Meal and Rest Periods.
- 9 30. These violations are due, in part, to the fact that Defendants do not possess a legal Rest Period
10 policy or practice, as its Rest Period policy lacks required language, resulting in employees
11 failing to receive all Rest Periods legally due. Defendants do not provide Rest Periods, as
12 defined by California law. Further, Defendants have never provided a fully-compliant Rest
13 Period penalty payment to any employee.
- 14 31. Defendants also do not possess a legal Meal Period policy, and make no attempt to ensure that
15 its employees are either timely or wholly provided Meal Periods. The employees would often
16 either miss a Meal Period entirely, be provided a short or late Meal Period, or be provided only
17 one Meal Period, even when they were working in excess of 10 hours a day. Additionally,
18 Defendants failed to accurately record its employees actual start and stop times of Meal
19 Periods, in violation of the IWC Wage Orders. 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 11050 (6)(A)(3).
20 Defendants also improperly "alter" employee meal period times.
- 21 32. Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices preclude "duty-free" Meal and Rest Periods, in
22 that the employees are required to remain "On Call" at all times, including during the Meal and
23 Rest Periods, in order to (among other reasons) respond to job-site supervisors. These
24 institutional and established practices of Defendants are illegal, in that Plaintiff and all other
25 class members were denied proper and/or timely Meal and Rest Periods.
- 26 33. Defendants willfully failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and all other class members one
27 additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for all workdays that a Meal or Rest Period
28 was not provided, as required by Labor Code section 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 5 (11), (12).

1 34. Any payments made by Defendants for missed or late Meal Periods were not paid at an
2 employee's regular rate in violation of Labor Code section 226.7 and the operative IWC Wage
3 Orders. Instead, these payments were made at an employee's base rate and did not include the
4 value of, *inter alia*, additional compensation and/or employee benefits such as employee
5 discounts and non-discretionary bonuses.

6 35. As a direct result of Defendants' willful failure and refusal to comply with the California Labor
7 Code, Plaintiff and other employees have suffered injury, loss, and harm in a sum according
8 to proof. On behalf of the class, Plaintiff hereby seeks compensatory damages, back pay (or
9 penalty), prejudgement interest, and other remedies set forth below.

10 36. Plaintiff has incurred and continues to incur legal expenses and attorneys' fees. Plaintiff is
11 presently unaware of the precise amount of these expenses and fees and prays leave of court
12 to amend this Complaint when the amounts are more fully known.

13 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
14 **Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1197**
15 **Class Action**
(Individually, and on behalf of the Class against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)

16 37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 36 as though fully set forth herein.

17 38. Throughout the applicable time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members were denied the
18 benefits and protections of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order(s) and were
19 damaged thereby.

20 39. Defendants failed to pay its employees all compensation due, including overtime
21 compensation, in violation of, among other statutes, Labor Code sections 510 and 1197. This
22 failure was caused by several separate uniform practices of Defendants. This failure was caused
23 by and through Defendants failure to maintain accurate Time Records (as required by
24 California law), to the detriment of the employee. Specifically, although Defendants would
25 receive "to-the-minute" start and end times (from its employees required actions), Defendants
26 would thereafter alter - and deduct time from - the Time Records, prior to payment of
27 compensation to the employees. Additionally, the right to receive the proper minimum wage
28 and overtime compensation was impacted by Defendants knowingly failing to consider other

1 work performed by the employees. Finally, Defendants' failed to keep accurate time records
2 which reflected when its employees were actually working or under Defendants' control. These
3 actions, and instructions, caused the employees to lose compensation, including the proper
4 minimum wage and overtime compensation.

5 40. Additionally, Defendants failed to properly calculate Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for purposes
6 of overtime compensation such that the value of employee's benefits were not included in the
7 calculation of Plaintiff's regular rate of pay. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
8 alleges that at all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to take into account the value of all
9 employee benefits when calculating their regular rates of pay, for purposes of overtime
10 compensation, in violation of Labor Code section 510. Additionally, by altering its employees'
11 time records, as referenced above, Defendants alter the actual hourly rate of pay for its
12 employees. Defendants do not factor in this actual hourly rate, when calculating the overtime
13 rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code section 510.

14 41. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and all other class members all compensation due, including
15 Overtime Compensation, due in violation of, among other statutes, Labor Code section 510.
16 These violations occurred due to Defendants' illegal policies, referenced above, including the
17 failure to accurately record employee time worked, whereby employees experienced monetary
18 under-compensation. These violations also occurred as Defendants had several policies and
19 practices which required employees to work in excess of 8 hours, without receiving all
20 overtime (and/or double-time) compensation. The systematic failure to provide proper
21 overtime compensation is a violation of California law.

22 42. As a direct result of Defendants' willful failure and refusal to comply with the California Labor
23 Code, Plaintiff and other employees have suffered injury, loss, and harm all to their damages
24 in a sum according to proof. On behalf of the class, Plaintiff hereby seeks compensatory
25 damages, back pay (or penalty), prejudgement interest, and other remedies set forth below.

26 43. Plaintiff has incurred and continues to incur legal expenses and attorneys' fees. Plaintiff is
27 presently unaware of the precise amount of these expenses and fees and prays leave of court
28 to amend this Complaint when the amounts are more fully known.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
Wage Statement Violations Pursuant to Labor Code § 226
Class Action
(Individually, and on behalf of the Class against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)

44. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 43 as though fully set forth herein.
45. Throughout the applicable time period, Plaintiff and the other class members were denied the benefits and protections of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order(s) and were damaged thereby.
46. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and all other members of the Class action with accurate itemized wage statements in violation of, among other statutes, Labor Code section 226. These violations include, but are not limited to, Defendants failure to provide an accurate showing of the gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1), due to under-payments caused by the "Regular" time and Overtime allegations listed above, Defendants failure to accurately identify all applicable regular and overtime (including double-time) rates of pay in violation of section 226(a)(9), and providing inaccurate representations of both "gross" and "net wages." Defendants also failed to provide the "inclusive dates of the pay period," in violation of 226(a)(6). Defendants also failed to provide an accurate showing of the "total hours worked," in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2). Defendants failed to provide an accurate showing of the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(8).
47. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(9) by failing to furnish an accurate showing of all applicable hourly rates, in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Plaintiff and the other employees were not compensated for all hours worked (due in part to Defendants requiring employees to list only *scheduled* work-times, not actual work-times to include "on-call" hours).
48. As a direct result of Defendant's willful failure and refusal to comply with the California Labor Code, Plaintiff and other employees have suffered injury, loss, and harm all to their damages in a sum according to proof. On behalf of the class, Plaintiff hereby seeks compensatory

1 damages, back pay (or penalty), prejudgement interest, and other remedies set forth below.
2 49. Plaintiff has incurred and continues to incur legal expenses and attorneys' fees. Plaintiff is
3 presently unaware of the precise amount of these expenses and fees and prays for leave of court
4 to amend this Complaint when the amounts are more fully known.

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
6 **Failure to Reimburse Pursuant to Labor Code § 2802**
7 **Class Action**

8 **(Individually, and on behalf of the Class against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)**

9 50. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 49 as though fully set forth
10 herein.

11 51. Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and all other Class Members for all necessary business
12 expenditures incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties in violation of,
13 among other statutes, Labor Code section 2802. These expenditures are the result of, *inter alia*,
14 Defendants' standard policies which require its employees to incur mileage costs without full
15 reimbursement. Plaintiff and all other Class Members were also forced to incur cell phone
16 costs, without reimbursement.

17 52. As a direct result of Defendants' willful failure and refusal to comply with the California Labor
18 Code, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees have suffered injury, loss, and harm all to
19 their damages in a sum according to proof. On behalf of the class, Plaintiff hereby seeks
20 compensatory damages, back pay (or penalty), prejudgement interest, and other remedies set
21 forth below.

22 53. Plaintiff has incurred and continues to incur legal expenses and attorneys' fees. Plaintiff is
23 presently unaware of the precise amount of these expenses and fees and prays for leave of court
24 to amend this Complaint when the amounts are more fully known.

25 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
26 **Failure to Pay Wages Upon Separation Pursuant to Labor Code § 203**
27 **Class Action**

28 **(Individually, and on behalf of the Class against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)**

54. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 53 as though fully set forth
herein.

55. Throughout the applicable time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members were denied the

benefits and protections of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order(s) and were damaged thereby. These violations resulted from, among other unlawful actions, Defendants willful failure to provide accurate and complete compensation to class members under Labor Code sections 226.7, 510, 512, 1197, and 2802.

56. As set forth above, Defendants failed (and continue to fail) to provide all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and all other class members throughout the course of their employment. As a direct result of this failure, Plaintiff and all other class members who were discharged or quit were denied all wages due and owing when they received their final paychecks. These final paychecks failed to take into account all outstanding wages due as a result of Defendants' standard and institutionalized payroll practices.

57. Labor Code section 203 provides for waiting time penalties for failing to pay wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, in violation of Labor Code section 201. Accordingly, Plaintiff and all other putative class members seek these penalties as relief for Defendants' violations.

58. As a direct result of Defendants' willful failure and refusal to comply with the California Labor Code, Plaintiff and other employees have suffered injury, loss, and harm all to their damages in a sum according to proof. On behalf of the class, Plaintiff hereby seeks compensatory damages, back pay (or penalty), prejudgement interest, and other remedies set forth below.

59. Plaintiff has incurred and continues to incur legal expenses and attorneys' fees. Plaintiff is presently unaware of the precise amount of these expenses and fees and prays for leave of court to amend this Complaint when the amounts are more fully known.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200
Class Action

(Individually, and on behalf of the Class against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)

60. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 59 as though fully set forth herein.

61. Plaintiff is a direct victim of Defendants' illegal and/or unfair business acts and practices referenced in this complaint, has lost money as a result of such practices, and brings this action both in his individual capacity and on behalf of Defendants' current and former California-

1 based, nonexempt employees who share a common or general interest in the damages as a
2 result of the illegal and/or unfair practices.

3 62. The approximately 200 member class is ascertainable via their experience as Defendants'
4 current or former California-based, nonexempt employees. Class members share a community
5 of interest and an injury-in-fact as Defendants have violated California compensation laws,
6 thereby depriving class members of money earned. Based on the facts set forth above, it would
7 be impracticable to proceed in individual actions.

8 63. Plaintiff suffered an injury-in-fact pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 17204, and
9 lost money as a result of Defendants' illegal and/or unfair practices.

10 64. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of an ascertainable class who share a community of
11 interest pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 17203 and Code of Civil Procedure
12 section 382 and who share a common or general interest in the damages as a result of the
13 illegal and/or unfair practices, in that those individuals on whose behalf the action is brought
14 have also lost money as a result of Defendants' practices, as set forth above, and that it would
15 be impracticable to proceed as an individual plaintiff action.

16 65. As set forth above, during the course of Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed and refused
17 to properly pay Plaintiff and all other class members. Defendants also failed to comply with
18 fundamentally protective California laws including, but not limited to, Labor Code sections
19 201-203, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, and 2802, as well as IWC Wage Order 5, or any other
20 applicable Wage Order.

21 66. Business & Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* prohibits any unlawful, unfair, or
22 fraudulent business act or practice.

23 67. Plaintiff's allegations herein are based upon Defendants' institutional business acts and
24 practices.

25 68. Defendants' acts and practices, as described herein above, are unlawful and unfair, in that they
26 violate the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order(s).

27 69. As a direct result of Defendants' unlawful and unfair business acts and practices, Plaintiff and
28 all other class members have been denied wages earned, and have therefore been damaged in

1 an amount to be proven. Accordingly, Plaintiff prays for restitution and injunctive damages
2 in an amount to be proven.

3 70. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' unlawful and
4 unfair business practices, alleged above, are continuing in nature and are widespread.

5 71. On behalf of the ascertainable class, Plaintiff respectfully requests an injunction against
6 Defendants to enjoin them from continuing to engage in the illegal conduct alleged herein.

7 72. On behalf of the ascertainable class, Plaintiff respectfully requests restitution damages.

8 73. Plaintiff has incurred and continue to incur legal expenses and attorneys' fees. Plaintiff is
9 presently unaware of the precise amount of these expenses and fees, and prays for leave of
10 court to amend this complaint when the amounts are more fully known.

11 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Violation of Labor Code § 2698 et seq. - Representative Action**
13 **(By Plaintiff in a Representative Capacity)**

14 74. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 73 as though fully set forth
15 herein.

16 75. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code and Industrial
17 Welfare Commission Wage Orders of the State of California, including, but not limited to,
18 California Labor Code section 2698 et seq.

19 76. Throughout the operative limitations period, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were
20 denied the protections and benefits of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order(s) due to
21 Defendants' standard practices. Said violations were set forth in the causes of action above and
22 are re-stated below. This "PAGA" cause of action alleges that there are Two Hundred (200)
23 aggrieved employees are comprised of Defendants' current or former California-based
24 employees at all Defendants' locations.

25 77. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies and pre-filing requirements pursuant to
26 California Labor Code section 2699.3, and has also fulfilled all notice requirements under the
27 statute. To wit, on May 31, 2022, counsel for Plaintiff prepared and mailed a letter to the
28 California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") via USPS Certified Mail and
electronic-mail service. Copies of the letters were mailed to Defendants, GRAND

1 RESTAURANT GROUP, and GRAND RESTAURANT GROUP, INC., also via USPS
2 Certified Mail. These letters contained the specific provisions of the California Labor Code and
3 Business and Professions Code violated by Defendants, as well as the facts and theories in
4 support of Plaintiff's claims. (Please see **Exhibit 1**, a true and correct copy of this letter.)

5 The statutory time period for the LWDA to investigate and/or respond, and for the employers
6 to respond, has concluded, allowing Plaintiff to proceed with this lawsuit.

7 78. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants were and are "employers" as that term is used
8 within the relevant sections of the California Labor Code.

9 79. Throughout the Class Period, Defendants committed the above-referenced and incorporated
10 Labor Code and Wage Order violations against Plaintiff and the other employees. To wit,
11 throughout their employment, Plaintiff and all other California non-exempt employees during
12 the limitations period were and are denied full and accurate compensation, including overtime
13 compensation and minimum wages, in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 510 and
14 1194. Plaintiff and the other class members were and are denied Meal and Rest Periods and
15 Meal and Rest Period payments, in violation of, *inter alia*, IWC Wage Order 5 (or any other
16 applicable Wage Order) and Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512. Defendants failed to furnish
17 accurate itemized wage statements in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code section 226.
18 Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other class members for necessary business
19 expenditures in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code section 2802. Defendants failed to provide
20 all compensation due at termination of employment in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code
21 sections 201 through 203.

22 80. As California Labor Code Section 2699 provides for civil penalties recoverable by Plaintiff on
23 behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees by and through Labor Code section 2699.3,
24 and as Plaintiff has complied with the pre-filing requirements, Plaintiff may recover the
25 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as more specifically set forth in the below
26 Prayer For Relief.

27 81. As a direct result of Defendants' failure to comply with the provisions of the Labor Code and
28 orders of the commission, Plaintiff and other employees of Defendants have been damaged in

1 an amount to be proved at trial.

2 82. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory civil penalties for each underpaid employee of Defendants
3 pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) for each of these employees.

4 83. Plaintiff also seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code
5 section 2699(g)(1).

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff on his own behalf and on behalf of all members of the proposed
8 Class, prays for judgment as follows:

- 9 1. For an order certifying the proposed class(es);
- 10 2. For compensatory damages according to proof, as set forth under Labor Code sections 510,
11 1194, and 2802, among other statutes;
- 12 3. For penalties and restitution of wages according to proof, as set forth under Labor Code
13 sections 221, 226, 226.7 and 1197.1, among other statutes;
- 14 4. For penalties pursuant to Title 8, California Code of Regulations, Wage Order 5 (or any
15 applicable Wage Order);
- 16 5. For lost back pay in an amount to be proven;
- 17 6. On behalf of the ascertainable Class, for a permanent injunction against Defendants restraining,
18 preventing, and enjoining Defendants from engaging in the illegal practices alleged, and to
19 ensure compliance with, among other employee protections, Labor Code sections 226, 226.7,
20 510, 512, 1197, and 2802;
- 21 7. On behalf of the ascertainable Class, for restitution damages on behalf of the section 17200
22 claimants who share a common or general interest;
- 23 8. Where available, for liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code section 1194.2;
- 24 9. For an award of interest, including prejudgment interest, pursuant to Labor Code section
25 218.6;
- 26 10. For an award of attorneys' fees and costs of suit herein pursuant to Labor Code sections 218.5,
27 226, 1194, 2802 and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; and
- 28 11. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

Dated: August 30, 2022

Eric Yarbush

17

Exhibit 1

SULLIVAN & YAECKEL

LAW GROUP

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

2330 THIRD AVENUE
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

PHONE 619-702-6760
FACSIMILE 619-702-6761

May 31, 2022

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator

Submitted Via Online Filing

Re: Calvin Hill v. Grand Restaurant Group; Grand Restaurant Group, Inc.
Our File No.: 7301

Dear Administrator:

Please allow this correspondence to serve as "written notice," as required by California Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(1), of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code believed to have been violated by Grand Restaurant Group; Grand Restaurant Group, Inc. (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Grand"), in the above referenced matter. This "written notice" is filed on behalf of Mr. Hill, and all current and former non-exempt employees employed by Grand. Thank you for your assistance and instruction on this issue.

The specific provisions alleged to have been violated by Grand are as follows:

CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 201-203, 226, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197.1, 1198.5 and 2802, as well as IWC Wage Order 5, and any other applicable wage orders, codified as Title 8, California Code of Regulations, section 11050 *et seq.*

Facts and theories supporting the allegations: Mr. Hill was employed as a non-exempt employee for Grand from approximately November 2020, through the current date.

///

///

Throughout the term of Mr. Hill's employment, Grand required Mr. Hill and all other non-exempt employees to experience actions illegal under the California Labor Code, including the following:

Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations

- Grand failed to provide all compensation, including minimum wage and overtime compensation, as well as compensation for work performed inside of Meal and Rest Periods, to its employees in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 1194, 510, IWC Wage Order 5, and any other applicable wage orders. This illegal action is due, in part, to Grand's policies of (1) failing to properly retain accurate Time Records, in violation of California law, and (2) failing to provide compensation (including both minimum and overtime compensation) for all time worked by the employees, or in control of the employer. For instance, Grand would instruct Mr. Hill to report scheduled (as opposed to *actual*) work hours, resulting in a loss of compensation. Additionally, Grand would often require Mr. Hill to work extended hours (beyond scheduled hours), without compensation. Further, Grand would regularly contact Mr. Hill outside of normal work hours (*i.e.*, "after hours" or during lunch) without compensation.
- Additionally, among other issues, Grand has notice of Mr. Hill, and others, working outside of their scheduled and/or reported hours, as well as *within* Meal and Rest Periods, but fails to provide any compensation for this work-time. Mr. Hill was frequently scheduled to be "On Call" outside of when his work shifts ended, but was never compensated for this time. Further, Grand failed to properly calculate and pay overtime at the actual overtime rate of pay, as Grand ignores certain compensation when calculating the Regular Rate of Pay.

Failure to Provide Compliant Meal Periods

- Grand failed to provide compliant Meal Periods or requisite Meal Period penalty payments, in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Order 5, or any other applicable wage orders. For example, Grand does not possess a legal Meal Period policy and makes no attempt to ensure that its employees are either timely or wholly provided Meal Periods. The employees would often either miss a Meal Period entirely, or be provided a short or untimely Meal Period. Whether or not an employee was provided a Meal Period was often contingent upon the how busy or understaffed the employees were on a given day.
- Grand would pressure its employees to either skip, or cut short, a Meal Period as employees were expected to respond to supervisors and/or customers at all times. Grand has never provided a compliant Meal Period penalty payment to any employee as to the above referenced issues. Finally, on the rare occasions when employees

were paid Meal Period penalties (i.e. California Meal Period Premiums), such payments do not “cure” the stated Labor Code violation under section 226.7. The California Supreme Court held that “An employer’s failure to provide an additional hour of pay does not form part of a section 226.7 violation, and an employer’s provision of an additional hour of pay does not excuse a section 226.7 violation. The failure to provide required meal and rest breaks is what triggers a violation of section 226.7.” (*Kirby v. Immoos Fire Protection, Inc.* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1244, 1256, italics added.). Even more recently, a 2020 California Supreme Court ruling stated that, “The remedy for a Labor Code violation, through settlement or other means, is distinct from the fact of the violation itself. For example, employers can pay an additional hour of wages as a remedy for failing to provide meal and rest breaks. (§ 226.7, subd. (c).) But we have held that payment of this statutory remedy ‘does not excuse a section 226.7 violation.’” *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.*, (2020) 9 Cal.5th 73. To be clear, payment of a Meal Period penalty to employees does not rectify the violation, it is in fact an admission of a Labor Code violation. Finally, Grand failed to pay Meal Period Premiums at the proper rate, as Grand fails to either (1) pay a full hours worth of pay, or (2) properly calculate the regular rate of pay for purposes of determining the premium rate owed. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*, S259172 (Slip Op. at p.1).

- Grand required its employees to constantly monitor their cell phones and be “on-call” at all times, specifically during Meal Periods. On occasion, Grand would interrupt, or cut short, its employees’ Meal Periods and require them to return to work.
- Grand illegally retained control over its employees during Meal Periods. For example, Grand required its employees to “remain on the premises,” and to remain “On Call” (i.e. monitor their phones) at all times, including during Meal Periods.

Failure to Provide Compliant Rest Periods

- Grand failed to provide compliant Rest Periods or requisite Rest Period penalty payments, in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Order 5, and any other applicable wage orders. For example, Grand does not possess a legal Rest Period policy, as its Rest Period policy lacks required language under California law. Grand makes no attempt to ensure that its employees are either timely or wholly provided Rest Periods. The employees would often either miss a Rest Period entirely, be provided a short or untimely Rest Period, or be provided only one Rest Period, even when they were working in excess of 6.5 hours a day. Grand would pressure its employees to either skip, or cut short, a Rest Period as employees were expected to respond to supervisors and/or customers at all times. Mr. Hill often was required to work during Rest Periods in order to complete his daily duties before he ended his shift for the day. Grand has never provided a compliant Rest Period penalty payment to any employee as to the above referenced issues. Finally, on the rare

occasions in which Grand would provide a Rest Period penalty, it would pay said penalty at an improper (and *lesser*) rate, due to the failure to properly calculate the Regular Rate of Pay.

- Grand required its employees to constantly monitor their cell phones and be "on-call" at all times, specifically during Rest Periods. On occasion, Grand would interrupt, or cut short, its employees' Rest Periods and require them to return to work.
- Finally, Grand illegally retained control over its employees during Rest Periods. For example, Grand required its employees to "remain on the premises," and to remain "On Call" (*i.e.* monitor their telephones) at all times, including during Rest Periods.

Wage Statement Violations

- Grand violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to furnish an accurate showing of all hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Mr. Hill, and other employees were not compensated for all hours worked (due in part to Grand's requirement that employees list only *scheduled* work-times, not actual work-times.)
- Grand violated Labor Code section 226(a)(5) by failing to furnish an accurate showing of the net wages earned by its employees. For example, Grand (a) would not provide compensation for all hours and minutes worked, (b) would use an improper (and lesser) Overtime Rate of Pay, and (c) would fail to pay Meal and/or Rest Period penalties when due. Further, on the rare occasions in which Grand would provide a Meal or Rest Period penalty, it would pay said penalty at an improper (and lesser) rate, due to the failure to properly calculate the Regular Rate of Pay.
- Grand violated Labor Code section 226(a)(8) by failing to provide an accurate showing of the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer. For example, "Grand Restaurant Group, Inc." is listed on Mr. Hill's Wage Statement as his employer (See **Exhibit A**), however the Status of "Grand Restaurant Group, Inc." is listed with the California Secretary of State as "Suspended-FTB" (See **Exhibit B**), nor is it listed as a recognized D.B.A. with the San Diego County Records Office.
- Grand violated Labor Code section 226(a)(9) by failing to furnish an accurate showing of all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Mr. Hill, and the other employees were not compensated for all hours worked (due in part to Grand requiring employees to list only *scheduled* work-times, not actual work-times to include "on-call" hours). As an example, for the pay period ending January 9, 2022, Grand states that it paid Mr. Hill for "4.61" total hours of Regular Pay. (Please see **Exhibit A**). However, Mr. Hill cannot "readily ascertain" what 4.61 means without "reference to other documents or information." Additionally, Grand does not

cc: Via Certified U.S. Mail

REGISTERED AGENTS INC
Agent for Service of Process for
GRAND RESTAURANT GROUP
1401 21st Street, Suite R
Sacramento, CA 95811

NORMAN E. TIPTON
Agent for Service of Process for
GRAND RESTAURANT GROUP, INC.
500 LA TERRAZA BLVD #110
ESCONDIDO, CA 92025

cc: Courtesy Copy and Filing Fee via U.S. Mail

Department of Industrial Relations
Accounting Unit
455 Golden Gate Ave, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Exhibit A

[illegible]

Exhibit B

California
Secretary of State

Business

UCC

Login

Business Search

The California Business Search provides access to available information for corporations, limited liability companies and limited partnerships of record with the California Secretary of State, with free PDF copies of over 17 million imaged business entity documents, including the most recent imaged Statements of Information filed for Corporations and Limited Liability Companies.

Currently, information for Limited Liability Partnerships (e.g. law firms, architecture firms, engineering firms, public accountancy firms, and land survey firms), General Partnerships, and other entity types are not contained in the California Business Search. If you wish to obtain information about LLPs and GPs, submit a Business Entities Order paper form to request copies of filings for these entity types. Note: This search is not intended to serve as a name reservation search. To reserve an entity name, select Forms on the left panel and select Entity Name Reservation ? Corporation, LLC, LP.

Basic Search

A Basic search can be performed using an entity name or entity number. When conducting a search by an entity number, where applicable, remove "C" from the entity number. Note, a basic search will search only ACTIVE entities (Corporations, Limited Liability Companies, Limited Partnerships, Cooperatives, Name Reservations, Foreign Name Reservations, Unincorporated Common Interest Developments, and Out of State Associations). The basic search performs a contains ?keyword? search. The Advanced search allows for a ?starts with? filter. To search entities that have a status other than active or to refine search criteria, use the Advanced search feature.

Advanced Search

© 2022 CA Secretary of State [Skip to main content](#)

<https://bizfileonline.sos.ca.gov/search/business>

GRANVILLE RESTAURANT GROUP, INC.
(3014956)



Request
Certificate

Initial Filing Date	08/30/2007
Status	Suspended - FTB
Standing - SOS	Good
Standing - FTB	Not Good
Standing - Agent	Good
Standing - VCFCF	Good
Inactive Date	12/02/2019
Formed In	CALIFORNIA
Entity Type	Stock Corporation - CA - General
Principal Address	888 PROSPECT STREET # 200 LA JOLLA, CA 92037
Mailing Address	888 PROSPECT STREET # 200 LA JOLLA, CA 92037
Statement of Info Due Date	08/31/2018
Agent	Individual 1343108 NORMAN E TIPTON 500 LA TERRAZA BLVD #110 ESCONDIDO, CA 92025



View History



Request Access