

09/01/22

Clerk of the Superior Court
By G. Ramirez, Deputy Clerk

MATERN LAW GROUP, PC
MATTHEW J. MATERN (SBN 159798)
DEANNA S. LEIFER (SBN 265840)
1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Tel: (310) 531-1900
Facsimile: (310) 531-1901

Attorneys for Plaintiff KURT
WEISSENBACH, individually and on
behalf of all other aggrieved employees

Assigned for All Purposes
H. JUDGE RANDALL SHERMAN
CX-105

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

KURT WEISSENBACH, individually and on
behalf of all other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CALIFORNIA PIZZA KITCHEN, INC., a
Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1 through
50, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 30-2022-01278828-CU-0E-CXC

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF
THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT OF 2004**

[California Labor Code § 2698, et seq.]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff KURT WEISSENBACH (“PLAINTIFF”), individually and on behalf of all other
2 aggrieved employees, hereby alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved
5 employees of defendants CALIFORNIA PIZZA KITCHEN, INC. (“CPK”) and DOES 1 through
6 50, inclusive (“DEFENDANTS”), in the State of California during the relevant statutory period to
7 recover penalties arising from DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide employees meal and rest
8 periods (or compensation therefor) as required under California law, unpaid minimum and
9 overtime wages, and unreimbursed business expenses.

10 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11 2. The Superior Court of the State of California has jurisdiction in this matter because
12 PLAINTIFF is a resident of the State of California, and DEFENDANTS are qualified to do
13 business in California and regularly conduct business in California. Further, no federal question is at
14 issue because the claims are based solely on California law.

15 3. Venue is proper in this judicial district and the County of Orange, California
16 because DEFENDANTS maintain offices and facilities and transact business in the County of
17 Orange, and DEFENDANTS’ illegal policies and practices which are the subject of this action
18 were applied, at least in part, to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees in the County of
19 Orange.

20 **THE PARTIES**

21 4. PLAINTIFF is a citizen and resident of the State of California. During the
22 relevant statutory period, PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California as a non-
23 exempt employee. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS as a Bartender/Server in California
24 from approximately May 3, 2018 to March 15, 2022.

25 5. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that CPK is, and at all
26 times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of
27 Delaware. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that CPK is
28 authorized to conduct business, and does conduct business, in the State of California.

Specifically, CPK maintains offices and facilities, conducts business, and engages in illegal policies or practices in the County of Orange.

6. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to PLAINTIFF at this time, and PLAINTIFF therefore sue such DOE defendants under fictitious names. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant designated as a DOE is in some manner highly responsible for the occurrences alleged herein, and that PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees' injuries and damages, as alleged herein, were proximately caused by the conduct of such DOE defendants. PLAINTIFF will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities of such DOE defendants when ascertained.

7. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANTS were the employers of PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all relevant times DEFENDANTS were the alter egos, divisions, affiliates, integrated enterprises, joint employers, subsidiaries, parents, principals, related entities, co-conspirators, authorized agents, partners, joint venturers, and/or guarantors, actual or ostensible, of each other. Each defendant was completely dominated by his, her, or its co-defendant, and each was the alter ego of the other.

8. At all relevant times, PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees were employed by DEFENDANTS under employment agreements that were partly written, partly oral, and partly implied. In perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein, DEFENDANTS acted pursuant to, and in furtherance of, their policies and practices of not paying PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees all wages earned and due, through methods and schemes which include, but are not limited to, failing to provide meal periods; failing to authorize and permit rest breaks; failing to pay minimum and overtime wages; failing to provide accurate itemized statements; failing to maintain required records; and failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for necessary expenditures, in violation of the California Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order.

1 9. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and every one
2 of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, and/or attributable to,
3 DEFENDANTS, each acting as agents and/or employees, and/or under the direction and control
4 of each of the other defendants, and that said acts and failures to act were within the course and
5 scope of said agency, employment and/or direction and control.

6 10. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful actions,
7 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees have suffered, and continue to suffer, from loss of
8 earnings in amounts as yet unascertained, but subject to proof at trial, and within the jurisdiction
9 of this Court.

10 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

11 11. Pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), Labor
12 Code §§ 2698-2699.5, PLAINTIFF brings this action on behalf of himself and all current and
13 former non-exempt aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS in the State of California at any time
14 within the period beginning one (1) year and sixty-five (65) days prior to the filing of this action,
15 and ending at the time this action settles or proceeds to final judgment ("PENALTY PERIOD").

16 12. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699.3, PLAINTIFF gave written notice on
17 May 10, 2022 by online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
18 ("LWDA") and by certified mail to CPK of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code
19 and IWC Wage Orders alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support
20 the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed and the LWDA has not
21 provided notice to PLAINTIFF that it intends to investigate the alleged violations.

22 13. Therefore, PLAINTIFF has complied with all of the requirements set forth in
23 California Labor Code § 2699.3 to commence a representative action under PAGA.

24 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

25 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

26 **[Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 11]**

27 14. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS had, and continue to have, a
28 policy and practice of failing to provide PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees full and

1 timely meal periods as required by California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage
2 Order No. 5-2001 § 11.

3 15. As a result of DEFENDANTS' policies and practices as alleged herein,
4 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees regularly were denied, and continue to be denied, the
5 opportunity to take full, uninterrupted, and timely meal periods as required under California
6 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 11.

7 16. DEFENDANTS further violated, and continue to violate, California Labor Code §
8 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 11 by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
9 aggrieved employees who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable
10 Wage Order, one (1) additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for
11 each workday that a meal period was not provided.

12 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

13 **[Labor Code § 226.7; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 12]**

14 17. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS had, and continue to have, a
15 policy and practice of failing to authorize and permit PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees
16 to take rest breaks as required by California Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-
17 2001 § 12. As a result of DEFENDANTS' policies and practices as alleged herein, PLAINTIFF
18 and other aggrieved employees regularly were denied, and continue to be denied, the opportunity
19 to take full, uninterrupted, and timely rest periods as required under California Labor Code §
20 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 12.

21 18. DEFENDANTS further violated, and continue to violate, California Labor Code §
22 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 12 by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
23 employees who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order,
24 one (1) additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday
25 that a rest period was not provided.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

2 **[Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 4]**

3 19. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-
4 2001 § 4, payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours
5 worked in a payroll period is unlawful.

6 20. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to, and continue to fail to,
7 pay PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees minimum wages for all hours worked by, among
8 other things: requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to
9 work off the clock; requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees
10 to work through meal breaks without compensation; rounding PLAINTIFF's and other aggrieved
11 employees' clock-in and clock-out times in a manner that resulted, over time, in failure to
12 compensate employees for all time worked; illegally and inaccurately recording time worked by
13 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees; and other methods to be discovered.

14 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

15 **[Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 3]**

16 21. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-
17 2001 § 3, DEFENDANTS are required to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
18 employees for all overtime at a rate of one and one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate of pay for all
19 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and for the
20 first eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive workday and at a rate of twice the regular rate of
21 pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday and for all hours worked
22 in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in any workweek.

23 22. PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees are current and former non-exempt
24 employees entitled to the protections of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage
25 Order No. 16-2001. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to
26 fail, to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for all overtime hours worked as
27 required under the foregoing provisions of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order by,
28 among other things: failing to pay overtime at one and one-half (1 ½) times or double the regular

1 rate of pay as provided by California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-
2 2001 § 3; requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to work
3 off the clock; requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to
4 work through meal breaks without compensation; rounding PLAINTIFF's and other aggrieved
5 employees' clock-in and clock-out times in a manner that resulted, over time, in failure to
6 compensate employees for all time worked; illegally and inaccurately recording time in which
7 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees worked; and other methods to be discovered.

8 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

9 **[Labor Code § 204]**

10 23. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 204, for all labor performed between the 1st
11 and 15th days of any calendar month, DEFENDANTS are required to pay their nonexempt
12 employees between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.
13 California Labor Code § 204 also provides that for all labor performed between the 16th and 26th
14 days of any calendar month, DEFENDANTS are required to pay their nonexempt employees
15 between the 1st and 10th day of the following calendar month. In addition, California Labor
16 Code § 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be
17 paid no later than the payday of the next regular payroll period.

18 24. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to
19 timely pay PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees all the wages for labor performed by the
20 next regular payroll period as required by California Labor Code § 204.

21 **Failure to Pay All Wages Due to Discharged and Quitting Employees**

22 **[Labor Code §§ 201, 202]**

23 25. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, DEFENDANTS are required
24 to timely pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee upon separation.

25 26. California Labor Code § 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an
26 employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
27 immediately.

28

1 27. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 202, DEFENDANTS are required to pay all
2 accrued wages due to an employee no later than 72 hours after the employee quits his or her
3 employment, unless the employee provided 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to
4 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or wages at the time of quitting.

5 28. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to
6 pay accrued wages and other compensation to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees in
7 accordance with California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

8 **Failure to Maintain Required Records**

9 **[Labor Code §§ 226, 1174; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7]**

10 29. During the PENALTY PERIOD, as part of DEFENDANTS' illegal payroll
11 policies and practices to deprive PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees of all wages earned
12 and due, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to maintain records as required under
13 California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7, including but not
14 limited to the following records: total daily hours worked by each employee; applicable rates of
15 pay; all deductions; meal periods; time records showing when each employee begins and ends
16 each work period; and accurate itemized statements.

17 **Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

18 **[Labor Code § 226; IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7]**

19 30. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF
20 and other aggrieved employees with timely and accurate itemized wage statements in writing
21 showing each employee's gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions made, net
22 wages earned, the name and address of the legal entity or entities employing PLAINTIFF and
23 other aggrieved employees, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and
24 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of California Labor
25 Code § 226 and IWC Wage Order No. 5-2001 § 7.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 36. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), PLAINTIFF seeks civil penalties for
2 DEFENDANTS' violations of Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is specifically
3 provided, including but not limited to the following:

4 a. Pursuant to Labor Code § 210, for violations of Labor Code § 204,
5 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred
6 dollars (\$100) for the initial violation for each failure to pay each employee
7 and two hundred dollars (\$200) per employee for violations in subsequent
8 pay periods.

9 b. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3, for violations of Labor Code § 226(a),
10 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred
11 and fifty dollars (\$250) per aggrieved employee for the initial pay period
12 where a violation occurs and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per aggrieved
13 employee for violations in subsequent pay periods.

14 c. Pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a), "[a]ny employer or other person acting
15 on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section
16 of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any
17 order of the Industrial Welfare Commission," including Labor Code §§ 510
18 and 512, shall be subject to a civil penalty, in addition to any other penalty
19 provided by law, of fifty dollars (\$50) for initial violations for each
20 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
21 underpaid and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation for
22 each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
23 underpaid.

24 d. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, for violations of Labor Code § 1174(d),
25 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars
26 (\$500).

27 e. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1, an employer who pays or causes to be
28 paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an order of

1 the commission, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: for any initial
2 violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
3 each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is
4 underpaid; and for each subsequent violation of the same offense, two
5 hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
6 period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the
7 initial violation was intentionally committed.

8 37. Labor Code § 2699(f) provides that for all Labor Code violations for which a civil
9 penalty is not specifically provided, the following civil penalties are established: one hundred
10 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two
11 hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.
12 PLAINTIFF seeks such civil penalties under Labor Code § 2699(f) for DEFENDANTS'
13 violations of Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is not specifically provided,
14 including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 204, 226.7, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, individually and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees,
17 respectfully prays for relief against DEFENDANTS, as follows:

18 1. For civil penalties according to proof, and all penalties authorized by the Labor
19 Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(a) and (f);

20 2. For interest at the legal rate pursuant to California Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3288
21 and/or any other applicable provision providing for pre-judgment interest;

22 3. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g) and/or
23 any other applicable provisions providing for attorney's fees and costs; and

24 4. For such further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 DATED: September 1, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

2 **MATERN LAW GROUP, PC**

3 

4 By:

MATTHEW J. MATERN

DEANNA S. LEIFER

Attorneys for Plaintiff KURT WEISSENBACH,
individually and on behalf of all other aggrieved
employees

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

- 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

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

Civil Complex Center
751 W. Santa Ana Blvd
Santa Ana, CA 92701

SHORT TITLE: Weissenbach vs. California Pizza Kitchen, Inc

**CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC
SERVICE**

CASE NUMBER:
30-2022-01278828-CU-OE-CXC

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that the following document(s), dated , dated , dated , have been transmitted electronically by Orange County Superior Court at Santa Ana, CA. The transmission originated from Orange County Superior Court email address on September 7, 2022, at 9:15:15 AM PDT. The electronically transmitted document(s) is in accordance with rule 2.251 of the California Rules of Court, addressed as shown above. The list of electronically served recipients are listed below:

MATERN LAW GROUP, PC
MMATERN@MATERNLAWGROUP.COM

Clerk of the Court, by: Fidel Alvarra , Deputy

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE