

1 **BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.**
David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)
2 *david@tomorrowlaw.com*
Vedang J. Patel (SBN 328647)
3 *vedang@tomorrowlaw.com*
Brandon M. Chang (SBN 316197)
4 *brandon@tomorrowlaw.com*
1460 Westwood Boulevard
5 Los Angeles, CA 90024
Telephone: (310) 438-5555
6 Facsimile: (310) 300-1705

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff, HENRY ALBARRAN and
on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees

8
9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

11 HENRY ALBARRAN, an individual, on
12 behalf of all others similarly situated, as an
aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other
13 aggrieved employees under the Labor Code
Private Attorney's General Act of 2004,

14
15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 SENIOR OPERATIONS LLC, a California
18 limited liability company; and DOES 1
through 100, inclusive,

19
20 Defendants.

CASE NO.: 22STCV18391

*[Assigned to the Hon. Lynne M. Hobbs in
Dept. 61]*

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAIN FOR:

1. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES;
2. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES;
3. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS;
4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS;
5. WAITING TIME PENALTIES;
6. WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS;
7. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES;
8. FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY;
9. UNFAIR COMPETITION.
10. UNDER THE LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS' GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1 and 2699

[Amount in Controversy Exceeds \$25,000.00]

COMES NOW Plaintiff HENRY ALBARRAN (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all others similarly situated and aggrieved, and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Class Action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382, against SENIOR OPERATIONS LLC (“Senior Operations”), and any of their respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (and, with DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below, “Defendants”) on behalf of Plaintiff and all other current and former non-exempt California employees employed by or formerly employed by Defendants (“Class Members”).

2. This is also a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against Senior Operations and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California, as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of California (“LWDA”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all other current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period, as further defined herein, and, as it pertains to the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code section 2810.5, Labor Code section 203, Labor Code section 226, Labor Code section 246, *et seq.*, Labor Code section 2802, restraints on competition, whistleblowing and freedom of speech on behalf of all employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period (collectively, “Aggrieved Employees”).

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

3. Plaintiff HENRY ALBARRAN is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege that Defendants employed Plaintiff HENRY ALBARRAN as a non-exempt employee, with duties that included, but were not limited to, picking grapes. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege that Plaintiff HENRY ALBARRAN worked for Defendants from approximately October of 2019 through the present.

///

///

1 **B. Defendants**

2 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Senior
3 Operations is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing
4 under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of Los
5 Angeles, State of California. At all relevant times herein, Senior Operations employed Plaintiff and
6 similarly situated employees within the State of California.

7 5. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
8 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,
9 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
10 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated
11 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
12 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of
13 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known. Plaintiff is
14 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent
15 to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or
16 policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the
17 other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to “Defendants,” it shall
18 include Senior Operations, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the
19 State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

20 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

21 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all the times
22 mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
23 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
24 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
25 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

26 7. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
27 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
28 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In

1 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of
2 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
3 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant
4 corporations respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
5 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
6 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

7 8. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
8 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

9 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

10 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all the times
11 mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
12 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
13 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
14 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

15 10. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
16 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
17 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In
18 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of
19 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
20 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant
21 corporations respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
22 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
23 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

24 11. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
25 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

26 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

27 12. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code
28 of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

1 13. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County, California pursuant to Code of Civil
2 Procedure sections 392, et seq. because, among other things, Los Angeles is where the causes of
3 action complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the
4 county in which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff, or some
5 of them, and Defendants was due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or
6 part of it, between Plaintiff, or some of them, and Defendants was actually performed; and the
7 county in which Defendants, or some of them, reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein
8 have a direct effect on Plaintiff and similarly aggrieved employees in Los Angeles, and because
9 Defendants employ numerous similarly aggrieved employees in Los Angeles County.

10 14. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
11 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
12 violations set forth herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, as the term “civil
13 penalty” is defined under *ZB N.A. v. Superior Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, under the Labor Code
14 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, et seq. (“PAGA”) plus
15 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, for Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former
16 employees of Defendants during the Civil Penalty Period.

17 15. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
18 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
19 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the
20 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

21 16. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding the provision of notice to the
22 LWDA regarding the herein-described Labor Code violations (the “Civil Penalty Period”),
23 Defendants violated, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226,
24 226.3, 226.7, 232, 232.5, 246, et seq., 432, 510, 512, 558, 1102.5, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
25 1197.5, 1198.5, 2699, 2802, and 2810.5, among others.

26 17. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes aggrieved employees
27 such as Plaintiff, on behalf of Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former employees within
28 the statutory period, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures

1 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

2 18. On or around June 6, 2022, Plaintiff provided written notice pursuant to Labor Code
3 section 2699.3 online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, of Defendants' violation
4 of various, including the herein-described, provisions of the Labor Code, to the LWDA, as well as
5 by certified mail, with return receipt requested to Defendants, and each of them.

6 19. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
7 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
8 calendar days of the June 6, 2022, postmarked date of the herein-described notice sent by Plaintiff
9 to the LWDA and Defendants.

10 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

11 20. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
12 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff, Class Members, and
13 Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a
14 result of, without limitation, Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees working over
15 eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and seven consecutive work days in a work week
16 without being properly compensated for hours worked in excess of (8) hours per day in a work day,
17 forty (40) hours per week in a work week, and/or hours worked on the seventh consecutive work
18 day in a work week by, among other things, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes
19 actually worked at the proper overtime rate of pay; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to
20 work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees to complete pre-shift tasks
21 before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue
22 working, to make phone calls off the clock; failing to include all forms of remuneration, including
23 piece rate compensation, non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, and other
24 forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the workweeks in which overtime was worked
25 and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay;
26 detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show
27 less hours than actually worked, and for paying straight pay instead of overtime pay to the detriment
28 of Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees.

1 21. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this Action and continuing to the
2 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff, Class Members, and
3 Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a
4 result of, among other things, at times, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually
5 worked at their regular rate of pay that is above the minimum wage engaging, suffering, or
6 permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees
7 to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for
8 meal periods and continue working, to make phone calls off the clock; detrimental rounding of
9 employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually
10 worked; failing to track and pay for all nonproductive time and failing to accurately track and pay
11 for rest and recovery periods that is separate and apart from any piece-rate compensation, to the
12 detriment of Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees.

13 22. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this Action and continuing to the
14 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to provide Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved
15 Employees, or some of them, full, timely thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal period for days on
16 which they worked more than five (5) hours in a work day and a second thirty (30) minute
17 uninterrupted meal period for days on which they worked in excess of ten (10) hours in a work day,
18 and failing to provide compensation for such unprovided meal periods as required by California
19 wage and hour laws.

20 23. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
21 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff, Class Members, and
22 Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to take rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4)
23 hours worked or major fraction thereof and failed to provide compensation for such unprovided rest
24 periods as required by California wage and hour laws.

25 24. For at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
26 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to pay Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved
27 Employees, or some of them, the full amount of their wages owed to them upon termination and/or
28 resignation as required by Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including for, without limitation,

1 failing to pay overtime wages, minimum wages, premium wages, and vacation pay pursuant to
2 Labor Code section 227.3.

3 25. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
4 of failing to timely pay Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees, among other wages,
5 all wages owed as a result of Defendants' practice or policy of failing to pay, among other wages,
6 overtime wages, minimum wages, premium wages, as required by Labor Code sections 201, 202,
7 and 203.

8 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
9 maintain policies or practices of failing to permit Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees from
10 taking cooldown rest periods as required under California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section
11 3395 and premium pay in lieu thereof under Labor Code section 226.7. As a result, Plaintiff would
12 be liable for civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

13 27. For at least one (1) year prior to the filing of this Action and continuing to the present,
14 Defendants have, at times, failed to furnish Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees, or
15 some of them, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours
16 worked; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
17 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; applicable piece rates in effect during
18 the pay period and the corresponding number of pieces earned; the name and address of the legal
19 entity that is the employer; name and address of the entity securing the services of the farm labor
20 contractor who employed Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees; the total hours of
21 compensable rest and recovery periods; the total hours of nonproductive time, and other such
22 information as required by Labor Code sections 226, subdivision (a) and 226.2. As a result thereof,
23 Defendants have further failed to furnish employees with an accurate calculation of gross and gross
24 wages earned, as well as gross and net wages paid.

25 28. For at least one (1) year prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the present,
26 Defendants have, at times, failed to pay Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees, or
27 some of them, the full amount of their wages for labor performed in a timely fashion as required
28 under Labor Code section 204.

1 29. For at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
2 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to indemnify Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved
3 Employees, or some of them, for the costs incurred in driving personal vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and
4 gas), purchasing uniforms, providing uniform and other deposits, separately laundering mandatory
5 uniforms, for the purchase of tools and safety equipment (including work boots to handle oil), for
6 the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, in direct consequence of
7 the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants, as required by
8 Labor Code 2802.

9 30. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
10 failing to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft
11 Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
12 Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment;
13 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the
14 name, address, and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information
15 regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants
16 under Labor Code section 2810.5.

17 31. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and
18 other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave, including but not limited to, COVID
19 paid sick leave , required to be provided pursuant to California law (including, without limitation
20 Labor Code section 246, *et seq.*), and also did not permit its use upon request as contemplated under
21 California laws, to the detriment of Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees.

22 32. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
23 failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code
24 Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of
25 any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the
26 labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any
27 calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month."

28 ///

1 33. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
2 of preventing Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge
3 and experience they obtained at Defendants for purposes of competing with Defendants, including,
4 without limitation, preventing Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with
5 a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Defendants and under what
6 circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. Plaintiff is informed
7 and believes that this policy and/or practice violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200,
8 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor
9 Code sections 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k).

10 34. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other
11 Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Defendants
12 to their managers or outside to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation
13 of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section
14 1102.5. In addition, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' herein-described policies
15 and/or practices prevent Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information
16 about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation
17 of Labor Code section 232 and 232.5.

18 35. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other
19 Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state
20 statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including,
21 without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, and 1197.5,
22 subdivision (k). Plaintiff is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes the exercise of
23 Plaintiff's and/or other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and
24 economic liberty.

25 36. Plaintiff, on their own behalf and on behalf of Class Members, brings this action
26 pursuant to, including but not limited to, Labor Code sections 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.2,
27 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 2802, 2810.3, *et seq.*, and California Code of Regulations,
28 Title 8, section 11040, seeking overtime wages, minimum wages, payment of premium wages for

missed meal and rest periods, failure to pay timely wages, waiting time penalties, wage statement penalties, failure to indemnify work-related expenses, other such provisions of California law, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

37. Plaintiff, on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of Class Members, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 through 17208, also seeks (an) injunction(s) prohibiting Defendants from further violating the Labor Code and requiring the establishment of appropriate and effective means to prevent further violations, as well as all monies owed but withheld and retained by Defendants to which Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled, as well as restitution of amounts owed.

38. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

39. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of Plaintiff and Class Members as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class of all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants within the State of California at any time commencing four (4) years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's complaint up until the time that notice of the class action is provided to the class (collectively referred to as "Class Members").

40. Plaintiff reserves the right under California Rule of Court rule 3.765, subdivision (b) to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity, further divide the defined class into subclasses, and to further specify or limit the issues for which certification is sought.

41. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed Class is easily ascertainable.

A. Numerosity

42. The potential Class Members as defined are so numerous that joinder of all the members of the Class is impracticable. While the precise number of Class Members has not been

determined yet, Plaintiff is informed and believes that there are over seventy-five (75) Class Members employed by Defendants within the State of California.

43. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant periods necessarily increases this number. Plaintiff alleges Defendants' employment records would provide information as to the number and location of all Class Members. Joinder of all members of the proposed Class is not practicable.

B. Commonality

44. There are questions of law and fact common to Class Members. These common questions include, but are not limited to:

- A. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 by failing to pay all hours worked at a proper overtime rate of pay?
- B. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 226.2, 510 and 1194 by failing to include piece rate compensation in calculation of the legal piece rate overtime rate?
- C. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1197 by failing to pay for all other time worked at the employee's regular rate of pay and a rate of pay that is greater than the applicable minimum wage?
- D. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226.2 by failing to track and pay for all nonproductive time that is separate and apart from any piece rate compensation?
- E. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226.2 by failing to track and pay for all rest and recovery time that is separate and apart from any piece rate compensation?
- F. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 512 by not authorizing or permitting Class Members to take compliant meal periods?
- G. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226.7 by not providing Class Members with additional wages for missed or interrupted meal periods?
- H. Did Defendants violate applicable Wage Orders by not authorizing or permitting Class Members to take compliant rest periods?
- I. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226.7 by not providing Class Members with additional wages for missed rest periods?

- 1 J. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 201 and 202 by failing to pay Class
2 Members upon termination or resignation all wages earned?
- 3 K. Are Defendants liable to Class Members for waiting time penalties under Labor Code
4 section 203?
- 5 L. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by not furnishing
6 Class Members with accurate wage statements?
- 7 M. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 226 and 226.2 by failing to furnish
8 employees paid on a piece rate basis with an itemized statement that included the
9 total hours of compensable nonproductive time, the rate of compensation, and the
10 gross wages paid for those periods during the pay period?
- 11 N. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 226 and 226.2 by failing to furnish
12 employees paid on a piece rate basis with an itemized statement that included the
13 total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the rate of compensation, and
14 the gross wages paid for those periods during the pay period?
- 15 O. Did Defendants fail to pay Class Members in a timely fashion as required under
16 Labor Code section 204?
- 17 P. Did Defendants fail to indemnify Class Members for all necessary expenditures or
18 losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or by obedience
19 to the directions of Defendants as required under Labor Code section 2802?
- 20 Q. Did Defendants violate the Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code
21 section 17200, *et seq.*, by their unlawful practices as alleged herein?
- 22 R. Are Class Members entitled to restitution of wages under Business and Professions
23 Code section 17203?
- 24 S. Are Class Members entitled to costs and attorneys' fees?
- 25 T. Are Class Members entitled to interest?

26 **C. Typicality**

- 27 45. The claims of Plaintiff herein alleged are typical of those claims which could be
28 alleged by any Class Members, and the relief sought is typical of the relief which would be sought

1 by each Class Member in separate actions. Plaintiff and Class Members sustained injuries and
2 damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of laws
3 and regulations that have the force and effect of law and statutes as alleged herein.

4 **D. Adequacy of Representation**

5 46. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of Class
6 Members. Counsel who represents Plaintiff is competent and experienced in litigating wage and
7 hour class actions.

8 **E. Superiority of Class Action**

9 47. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient
10 adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Class Members is not practicable, and
11 questions of law and fact common to Class Members predominate over any questions affecting only
12 individual Class Members. Class Members, as further described therein, have been damaged and
13 are entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' policies and/or practices that have resulted in the
14 violation of the Labor Code at times, as set out herein.

15 48. Class action treatment will allow Class Members to litigate their claims in a manner
16 that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system. Plaintiff is unaware of
17 any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would
18 preclude its maintenance as a class action.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **(Failure to Pay Overtime Wages – Against All Defendants)**

21 49. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
22 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

23 50. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former
24 employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1199, as well as applicable
25 Wage Orders.

26 51. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Labor Code section 510 was in effect and
27 provided: "(a) Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Any work in excess of eight hours in
28 one workday and any work in excess of forty hours in any one workweek . . . shall be compensated

1 at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.”

2 52. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Labor Code section 510 further provided that
3 “[a]ny work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice
4 the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any
5 seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of
6 pay.”

7 53. Four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present,
8 Plaintiff and Class Members, at times, worked for Defendant during shifts that consisted of more
9 than eight (8) hours in a workday and/or more than forty hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7)
10 consecutive workdays in a workweek, without being paid overtime wages for all hours worked as a
11 result of, including but not limited to, Defendant failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours
12 actually worked at the proper overtime rate of pay; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to
13 work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees to complete pre-shift tasks
14 before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue
15 working, to make phone calls off the clock; failing to include all forms of remuneration, including
16 piece rate compensation, non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, and other
17 forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the workweeks in which overtime was worked
18 and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay;
19 detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show
20 less hours than actually worked, and for paying straight pay instead of overtime pay to the detriment
21 of Employee and other aggrieved employees, to the detriment of Plaintiff and Class Members.

22 54. Accordingly, by requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to, at times, work greater
23 than eight (8) hours per workday, forty (40) hours per workweek, and/or seven (7) straight workdays
24 without properly compensating overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay, Defendants, on
25 occasion, willfully violated the provisions of the Labor Code, among others, sections 510, 1194, and
26 applicable IWC Wage Orders, and California law.

27 55. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and Class Members have
28 been deprived of overtime wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery,

1 plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to Labor Code section 1194
2 and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Failure to Pay Minimum Wages – Against All Defendants)**

5 56. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
6 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

7 57. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former
8 employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 1197, 1199 and applicable Wage Orders.

9 58. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197 and applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff and
10 Class Members were entitled to receive minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under
11 Defendants' control.

12 59. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the
13 present, Defendant failed, at times, to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked at
14 their regular rate of pay that is above the minimum wage; engaging, suffering, or permitting
15 employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees to complete
16 pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods
17 and continue working, to make phone calls off the clock; detrimental rounding of employee time
18 entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked; failing
19 to track and pay for all nonproductive time and failing to accurately track and pay for rest and
20 recovery periods that is separate and apart from any piece rare compensation, to the detriment of
21 Plaintiff and Class Members.

22 60. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have
23 suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid minimum wages
24 for all hours worked or otherwise due.

25 61. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 218.6, 1194, 1194.2, Code of Civil Procedure
26 sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
27 recover the full amount of unpaid minimum wages, interest and penalties thereon, liquidated
28 damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Failure to Provide Meal Periods – Against All Defendants)**

3 62. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
4 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

5 63. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former
6 employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders.

7 64. Pursuant to Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders, no employer shall
8 employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a timely meal break of
9 not less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties.
10 Furthermore, no employer shall employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours
11 per day without providing the employee with a second timely meal period of not less than thirty (30)
12 minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties.

13 65. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, if an employer fails to provide an employee
14 with a meal period as provided in the applicable Wage Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
15 the employer shall pay the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate
16 of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.

17 66. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the
18 present, Plaintiff and Class Members were, at times, not provided complete, timely 30-minute, duty-
19 free uninterrupted meal periods every five hours of work without waiving the right to take them, as
20 permitted. Moreover, at times, Defendant failed to provide one (1) additional hour of pay at the
21 Class Member's regular rate of compensation on the occasions that Class Members were not
22 provided compliant meal periods.

23 67. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and Class Members compliant meal periods as
24 contemplated by Labor Code section 512, among other California authorities, and failing, at times,
25 to provide compensation for such unprovided meal periods, as alleged above, Defendant willfully
26 violated the provisions of Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders.

27 68. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have
28 suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid additional pay

1 owed for missed, untimely, interrupted, incomplete and/or on-duty meal periods.

2 69. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of their unpaid
3 additional pay for unprovided compliant meal periods, in amounts to be determined at trial, plus
4 interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs, under Labor Code sections 226 and 226.7,
5 Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **(Failure to Provide Rest Periods – Against All Defendants)**

8 70. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
9 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

10 71. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former
11 employees of Defendants covered by applicable Wage Orders.

12 72. California law and applicable Wage Orders require that employers “authorize and
13 permit” employees to take ten (10) minute rest periods in about the middle of each four (4) hour
14 work period “or major fraction thereof.” Accordingly, employees who work shifts of three and-a-
15 half (3 ½) to six (6) hours must be provided ten (10) minutes of paid rest period, employees who
16 work shifts of more than six (6) and up to ten (10) hours must be provided with twenty (20) minutes
17 of paid rest period, and employees who work shifts of more than ten (10) hours must be provided
18 thirty (30) minutes of paid rest period.

19 73. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, if an employer fails to provide an employee
20 with a meal period or rest period as provided in the applicable Wage Order of the Industrial Welfare
21 Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's
22 regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.

23 74. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the
24 present, Plaintiff and Class Members were, at times, not authorized or permitted to take complete,
25 timely 10-minute, duty-free uninterrupted rest periods every four (4) hours of work or major fraction
26 thereof. Moreover, at times, Defendant failed to provide one (1) additional hour of pay at the Class
27 Member's regular rate of compensation on the occasions that Class Members were not authorized
28 or permitted to take compliant rest periods.

75. By their failure, at times, to authorize and permit Plaintiff and Class Members to take rest periods contemplated by California law, and one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for such unprovided rest periods, as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders.

76. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid additional pay owed for rest periods that they were not authorized or permitted to take.

77. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of their unpaid additional pay for unprovided compliant rest periods, in amounts to be determined at trial, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs, under Labor Code sections 226 and 226.7, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Termination – Against All Defendants)

78. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

79. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 203, as well as applicable Wage Orders.

80. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 and 202, Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled upon termination to timely payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to termination. Discharged Class Members were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to discharge immediately upon termination. Class Members who resigned were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to resignation within 72 hours after giving notice of resignation or, if they gave 72 hours previous notice, they were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid at the time of resignation.

81. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the three (3) years before the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Defendants, due to the failure, at times, to provide overtime wages mentioned above, failed to pay Plaintiff and Class

1 Members all wages earned prior to resignation or termination in accordance with Labor Code
2 sections 201 or 202.

3 82. Plaintiff is informed and believes Defendants' failure, at times, to pay Plaintiff and
4 Class Members all wages earned prior to termination or resignation in accordance with Labor Code
5 sections 201 and 202 was willful. Defendants had the ability to pay all wages earned by Plaintiff
6 and Class Members at the time of termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202,
7 but intentionally adopted policies or practices incompatible with the requirements of Labor Code
8 sections 201 and 202 resulting in the failure, at times, to pay all wages earned prior to termination
9 or resignation.

10 83. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
11 waiting time penalties from the date their earned and unpaid wages were due, upon termination or
12 resignation, until paid, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

13 84. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have
14 suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid for all wages earned
15 prior to termination or resignation.

16 85. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203 and 218.6, Code of Civil Procedure sections
17 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover
18 waiting time penalties, interest, and their costs of suit, as well.

19 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **(Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements – Against All Defendants)**

21 86. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
22 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

23 87. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former
24 employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 226, as well as applicable Wage Orders.

25 88. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiff and Class Members
26 were entitled to receive, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized
27 statement that accurately reflects, among other things, gross wages earned; total hours worked; net
28 wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding

1 number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and the name and address of the legal entity that is the
2 employer; and the name and address of the entity securing the services of the farm labor contractor
3 who employed Plaintiff and Class Members, among other things. Further, Labor Code section 226.2
4 requires that wage statements also include the total compensation earned for piece rate work
5 performed, total compensation for nonproductive work performed, total compensation for rest and
6 recovery periods, the total hours of nonproductive time worked and the rate of pay therefore, the
7 total hours of rest and recovery periods taken and the rate of pay therefore, the total amount of
8 overtime wages earned, and the proper overtime rate(s) of pay.

9 89. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
10 to provide Plaintiff and Class Members accurate itemized wage statements pursuant to Labor Code
11 sections 226, subdivision (a) and 226.2, subdivisions (a)(2)(A-B) on each and every wage statement
12 that should have been provided, including by failing to itemize and/or pay all nonproductive time
13 and rest and recovery time for each.

14 90. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the one (1) year
15 before the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Defendants failed to comply
16 with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by adopting policies and practices that resulted in their
17 failure, at times, to furnish Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized statements that
18 accurately reflect, among other things, gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned;
19 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
20 worked at each hourly rate; applicable piece rates in effect during the pay period and the
21 corresponding number of pieces earned; the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer;
22 name and address of the entity securing the services of the farm labor contractor who employed
23 Plaintiff and Class Members; the total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods; the total
24 hours of nonproductive time, and other such information as required by Labor Code sections 226,
25 subdivision (a) and 226.2. Defendants' failure to, at times, provide Plaintiff and Class Members
26 with accurate wage statements was knowing, intentional, and willful. Defendants had the ability to
27 provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with accurate wage statements, but, at times, willfully
28 provided wage statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

91. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury. The absence of accurate information on Class Members' wage statements at times has delayed timely challenge to Defendants' unlawful pay practices; requires discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed; causes difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records; and led to submission of inaccurate information about wages and amounts deducted from wages to state and federal governmental agencies, among other things.

92. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover \$50 for the initial pay period during the period in which violation of Labor Code section 226 occurred and \$100 for each violation of Labor Code section 226 in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate \$4,000.00 per employee.

93. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 226, subdivisions (e) and (g), Code of Civil Procedure section 1032, Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of penalties due under Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment – Against All Defendants)

94. Plaintiff reallege each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs and incorporate each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

95. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 204 and applicable Wage Orders.

96. Labor Code section 204 provides that “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

97. Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay

1 the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, and
2 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars
3 (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful
4 or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25
5 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

6 98. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the one (1) year
7 before the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Defendants employed policies
8 and practices that resulted in, at times, not paying Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with
9 Labor Code section 204.

10 99. Pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
11 recover penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code section 204, in the amount of one
12 hundred dollars (\$100) for each initial violation per Class Member, and two hundred dollars (\$200)
13 for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor
14 Code section 204 per Class Member, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

15 100. Pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and
16 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recovery of penalties,
17 interest, and their costs of suit, as well.

18 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Violation of Labor Code § 2802 – Against All Defendants)**

20 101. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
21 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

22 102. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former
23 employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 2802 and applicable Wage Orders.

24 103. Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (a) provides that “an employer shall indemnify
25 his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
26 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties . . .”

27 104. For three (3) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the
28 present, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members, or some of them, to incur, at times,

1 necessary expenditures or losses in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or at the
2 obedience to the directions of Defendants that included, without limitation: purchasing and using
3 cellular phones for work-related purposes.

4 105. During that time period, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege
5 that Defendants failed and refused, and still fail and refuse, at times, to reimburse Plaintiff sand
6 Class Members for those losses and/or expenditures.

7 106. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have
8 suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent they were not reimbursed for the
9 herein-described losses and/or expenditures.

10 107. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2802, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and
11 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover
12 reimbursement for their herein-described losses and/or expenditures, reasonable attorneys' fees and
13 costs of suit.

14 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **(Unfair Competition – Against All Defendants)**

16 108. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
17 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

18 109. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that the unlawful
19 conduct of Defendants alleged herein constitutes unfair competition within the meaning of Business
20 and Professions Code section 17200. Due to their unlawful business practices in violation of the
21 Labor Code, Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies
22 doing business in the State of California that comply with their obligations to compensate employees
23 in accordance with the Labor Code.

24 110. As a result of Defendants' unfair competition as alleged herein, Plaintiff and Class
25 Members have suffered injury in fact and lost money or property.

26 111. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff and Class
27 Members are entitled to (an) injunction(s) prohibiting Defendants from further violating the Labor
28 Code and requiring the establishment of appropriate and effective means to prevent further

1 violations, as well as restitution of all wages and other monies owed to them under the Labor Code,
2 including interest thereon, in which they had a property interest and which Defendants nevertheless
3 failed to pay them and instead withheld and retained for themselves. Restitution of the money owed
4 to Plaintiff and Class Members is necessary to prevent Defendants from becoming unjustly enriched
5 by their failure to comply with the Labor Code.

6 112. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to costs of suit under Code of Civil
7 Procedure section 1032 and interest under Civil Code section 3287.

8 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)**

10 113. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
11 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

12 **Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210**

13 114. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that:
14 “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for
15 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor
16 performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
17 between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

18 115. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated
19 that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this
20 article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3,
21 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
22 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For
23 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for
24 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

25 116. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of
26 failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as
27 per Labor Code section 204. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other
28 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor

1 Code section 204, in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for
2 each initial violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee
3 for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor
4 Code section 204.

5 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3

6 117. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code
7 section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
8 with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net
9 wages earned; the name and address of each employer with whom they have been placed to work;
10 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
11 worked at each hourly rate; the legal name of the employer; and other such information as required
12 by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

13 118. Labor Code section 226.3 states that “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
14 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
15 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
16 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
17 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.”

18 119. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that “[t]he civil penalties provided for in
19 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.”

20 120. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
21 and have a policy or practice of failing to furnish non-exempt employees, including, without
22 limitation, Plaintiff, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total
23 hours worked; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect and the
24 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate in effect during the pay period; the legal
25 name of the employer and; and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226,
26 subdivision (a).

27 121. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are
28 entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision

1 (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
2 for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay
3 period for each subsequent violation.

4 Violation of Labor Code § 558

5 122. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other person
6 acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating
7 hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission” shall be subject to a civil
8 penalty as follows:

- 9 (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee and for each
10 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient
11 to recover underpaid wages;
- 12 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
13 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
14 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;
- 15 (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.

16 123. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Defendants, and
17 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections described herein, including
18 causing Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees not to: be paid with the rates of pay and overtime
19 rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the
20 regular payday designated by Employer, the name of the employer, including any “doing business
21 as” names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance
22 carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information.

23 124. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
24 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
25 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty
26 dollars (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred
27 dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

28 ///

Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

125. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or the employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts, relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents, or papers of the person.”

126. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

127. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned.”

128. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).”

129. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have willfully failed keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment

1 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
2 under Labor Code section 1174.

3 130. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
4 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
5 recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
6 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per Aggrieved Employee.

7 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

8 131. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other
9 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
10 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
11 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
12 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
13 Section 203 as follows:

- 14 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars
15 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
16 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
17 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
18 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.
- 19 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
20 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
21 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
22 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
23 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
24 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.
- 25 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
26 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
27 employee."

28 132. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused

1 Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants,
2 without limitation, routinely failing to pay Plaintiffs or other Aggrieved Employees' to pay
3 minimum wages for all hours worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to actual
4 and liquidated damages.

5 133. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
6 pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
7 recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount one
8 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and
9 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each
10 subsequent violation.

11 Violation of Labor Code section 6400 et seq.

12 134. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants had and
13 have a policy or practice of failing to furnish and use safety devices and safeguards. And adopt and
14 use practices, means, methods, operations, and processes which are reasonably adequate to render
15 such employment and place of employment safe and healthful, pursuant to, including but not limited
16 to, Labor Code section 6401. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that
17 Defendants had and has a policy or practice of requiring or permitting employees to go or be in any
18 employment or place of employment which is not safe and healthful, pursuant to Labor Code section
19 6402. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants had and has a
20 policy or practice of failing or neglecting to: provide and use safety devices and safeguards
21 reasonably adequate to render the employment and place of employment safe; adopt and use
22 methods and processes reasonably adequate to render the employment and place of employment
23 safe; and do every other thing reasonably necessary to protect the life, safety, and health of
24 employees, pursuant to Labor Code section 6403.

25 135. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that these failures
26 include, without limitation, failing to disinfect time clocks and other surfaces after use by Plaintiff
27 and/or other aggrieved employees; failing to provide adequate protection equipment to Plaintiff
28 and/or other aggrieved employees; and failing to provide adequate distance in working conditions

1 between Plaintiff and/or other aggrieved employees.

2 136. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants had and
3 has a policy or practice of failing to give sufficient, adequate and proper notice to employees of the
4 Covid-19 exposure within one business day of receiving notice of potential Covid-19 workplace
5 exposure from a qualifying individual as required by Labor Code section 6409.6. Plaintiff is
6 informed and believes that numerous employees contracted COVID-19 during the relevant time
7 periods, but that Employer failed to provide notice to employees. Plaintiff is additionally informed
8 and believes that Defendants have not or did not keep adequate records of written notifications
9 required in subdivision (a) for a period of at least three years.

10 137. Specifically, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
11 Defendants had and have a practice or policy of failing within one business day after Defendants or
12 a representative of Defendants received a notice of potential exposure to COVID-19 to provide
13 written notice to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees, or their exclusive representatives, who
14 were on the premises at the same worksite as a qualifying individual who was within the infectious
15 period that they may have been exposed to COVID-19. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and
16 believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had and have a practice or policy of failing
17 within one business day after Defendants or a representative of Defendants received a notice of
18 potential exposure to COVID-19 to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees who were on
19 the premises at the same worksite as the qualifying individual within the infectious period and the
20 exclusive representative, if any, with information regarding COVID-19-related benefits to which
21 the employee may be entitled under applicable federal, state, or local laws, including, but not limited
22 to, workers' compensation, and options for exposed employees, including COVID-19-related leave,
23 company sick leave, state-mandated leave, supplemental sick leave, or negotiated leave provisions,
24 as well as antiretaliation and antidiscrimination protections of the employee. Plaintiff is informed
25 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated, without limitation, Labor Code
26 sections 6409.6 and 6432.

27 138. Additionally, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
28 Defendants had and have a practice or policy of failing within one business day after Defendants or

1 a representative of Defendants received a notice of potential exposure to COVID-19 to notify
2 Defendants and other aggrieved employees who were on the premises at the same worksite as the
3 qualifying individual within the infectious period, and the employers of subcontracted employees
4 who were on the premises at the same worksite as the qualifying individual within the infectious
5 period and the exclusive representative, if any, of the cleaning and disinfection plan that the
6 employer is implementing per the guidelines of the federal Centers for Disease Control and
7 Prevention and the COVID-19 prevention program per the Cal-OSHA COVID-19 Emergency
8 Temporary Standards. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
9 violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 6409.6 and 6432.

10 139. Moreover, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
11 Defendants had and have a practice or policy of failing to notify the local public health agency in
12 the jurisdiction of the worksite of the names, number, occupation, and worksite of employees who
13 had a laboratory-confirmed case of COVID-19, as defined by the State Department of Public Health;
14 a positive COVID-19 diagnosis from a licensed health care provider; a COVID-19-related order to
15 isolate provided by a public health official; or died due to COVID-19, in the determination of a
16 county public health department or per inclusion in the COVID-19 statistics of a county. Plaintiff is
17 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants violated, without limitation,
18 Labor Code sections 6409.6 and 6432.

19 140. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
20 pursuant to Labor Code sections 6400 *et seq*, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled
21 to recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount one
22 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and
23 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each
24 subsequent violation.

25 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

26 141. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other
27 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
28 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or

1 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
2 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
3 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

4 142. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), for all provisions of the Labor
5 Code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, the established civil penalty for
6 a violation of those provisions is as follows: if, at the time of the alleged violation, the person
7 employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved
8 employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved
9 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

10 143. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and
11 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described herein, including, without limitation, for
12 the failure to: pay the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment,
13 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Defendants, the
14 name of the employer, including any “doing business as” names used, the name, address and
15 telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick
16 leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employer under Labor Code
17 section 2810.5, failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with the amount of paid
18 sick leave, including but not limited to, COVID paid sick leave , required to be provided pursuant
19 to California and local laws.

20 144. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California
21 whom they seek to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs in
22 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

23 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

24 145. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all causes of action contained herein

25 **PRAYER**

26 **WHEREFORE**, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for
27 judgment against Defendants as follows:

28 ///

- 1 A. An order certifying this case as a Class Action;
- 2 B. An Order appointing Plaintiff as Class representative and appointing Plaintiff's
- 3 counsel as class counsel;
- 4 A. Damages for all wages earned and owed, including minimum and overtime wages
- 5 and unpaid wages for vested vacation time under Labor Code sections 203, 510,
- 6 227.3, 1194, 1197, and 1199;
- 7 B. Liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194.2 and 2810.3;
- 8 C. Damages for unpaid premium wages from missed meal and rest periods under,
- 9 among other Labor Code sections 512, and 226.7;
- 10 D. Penalties for inaccurate wage statements under Labor Code section 226,
- 11 subdivision (e);
- 12 E. Damages for unpaid penalty wages under Labor Code section 203;
- 13 F. Waiting time penalties under Labor Code section 203;
- 14 G. Penalties to timely pay wages under Labor Code section 210;
- 15 H. Damages under Labor Code section 2802;
- 16 I. Penalties for failure to timely permit inspection of documents under Labor Code
- 17 section 226, subdivision (b);
- 18 J. Preliminary and permanent injunction(s) prohibiting Defendants from further
- 19 violating the Labor Code and requiring the establishment of appropriate and
- 20 effective means to prevent further violations;
- 21 K. Restitution under Business and Professions Code section 17203;
- 22 L. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed by law;
- 23 M. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
- 24 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 25 N. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
- 26 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 27 O. For costs of suit incurred herein;
- 28 P. For reasonable attorneys' fees; and

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

Q. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper

Dated: July 11, 2024

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

BY: 
BRANDON M. CHANG

Attorneys for Plaintiff HENRY ALBARRAN an
individual, on behalf of all others similarly situated, as
an aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other
aggrieved employees under the Labor Code Private
Attorney's General Act of 2004