

sSeung L. Yang (SBN 249857)
 E-mail: seung.yang@thesentinel-firm.com
 Tiffany Hyun (SBN 311743)
 E-mail: tiffany.hyun@thesentinel-firm.com
 Jessica M. Abreu (SBN 343366)
 E-mail: Jessica.abreu@thesentinel-firm.com
THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC
 355 S. Grand Ave., Suite 1450
 Los Angeles, California 90071
 Telephone: (213) 985-1150
 Facsimile: (213) 985-2155

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

05/06/2025

David W. Stryker, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: R. Lozano Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff Olga Bermudez

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

OLGA BERMUDEZ, individually, and on behalf
 of all others similarly situated, and on behalf of
 other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
 California Private Attorneys General Act
 ("PAGA");

Plaintiff,

vs.

RRG BESH, INC., a California corporation;
 RRC BESH, INC., a California corporation; RRF
 BESH, INC., a California corporation;
 R@MESA, INC., a California corporation;
 R@MILPAS, INC., a California corporation;
 R@STATE, INC., a California corporation; KR
 BESH, INC., a California corporation; RRA
 BESH, INC., a California corporation; KJ
 BECK'S, INC., a California corporation; RLSR
 BECK'S INC., a California corporation; R.M.
 FAMILY CORPORATION, a California
 corporation; LUCRETIA & RICHARD, INC., a
 California corporation; THE BESH
 RESTAURANT CORPORATION, a California
 corporation; RLB FAMILY CORPORATION, a
 California corporation; R. L. BESH, INC., a
 California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
 inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 25STCV05692

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION AND
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226];
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.]; and
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, et seq.].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL



1 Plaintiff Olga Bermudez (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary
2 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further
3 investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant RRG Besh, Inc.; Defendant RRC
6 Besh, Inc.; Defendant RRF Besh, Inc.; Defendant R@mesa, Inc.; Defendant R@milpas, Inc.;
7 Defendant R@state, Inc.; Defendant KR Besh, Inc.; Defendant RRA Besh, Inc.; Defendant KJ
8 Beck’s, Inc.; Defendant RLSR Beck’s Inc.; Defendant R.M. Family Corporation; Defendant
9 Lucretia & Richard, Inc.; Defendant The Besh Restaurant Corporation; Defendant RLB Family
10 Corporation; Defendant R. L. Besh, Inc. and Does 1 through 10 (collectively referred to as
11 “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and unfair business practices stemming
12 from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to
13 provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate
14 records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated
15 employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate
16 wage statements.

17 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action individually and as a
18 class action on behalf of herself and certain current and former employees of Defendants
19 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully
20 below). The Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any
21 Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of
22 limitations period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

23 3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
24 California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
25 Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt, hourly-paid employees of
26 Defendants who worked in California during the applicable statute of limitations period
27 (hereinafter referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).
28



1 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
2 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based
3 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants
4 are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare
5 Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

6 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants
7 maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 8 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
9 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
10 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 11 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
12 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
13 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and
14 failing to pay an additional hour's pay at the regular rate of pay for each
15 workday a meal period violation occurred;
- 16 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
17 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
18 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay at the employee's
19 regular rate of pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred;
- 20 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 21 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
22 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within
23 the time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- 24 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked;
25 and
- 26 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
27 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
28 IWC Wage Orders.



6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

THE PARTIES

Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as an hourly, non-exempt employee from approximately 2018 to approximately September 2024.

9. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

Defendants

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant RRG Besh, Inc. is:

- (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada, California;
- (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.



1 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
2 alleges, that Defendant RRC Besh, Inc. is:

- 3 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
4 California;
- 5 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
6 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- 7 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
8 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
9 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
10 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

11 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
12 alleges, that Defendant RRF Besh, Inc. is:

- 13 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
14 California;
- 15 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
16 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- 17 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
18 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
19 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
20 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

21 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
22 alleges, that Defendant R@mesa, Inc. is:

- 23 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
24 California;
- 25 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
26 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- 27 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
28 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered



1 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
2 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

3 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
4 alleges, that Defendant R@milpas, Inc. is:

- 5 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
6 California;
- 7 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
8 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- 9 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
10 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
11 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
12 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

13 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
14 alleges, that Defendant R@state, Inc. is:

- 15 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
16 California;
- 17 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
18 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- 19 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
20 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
21 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
22 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

23 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
24 alleges, that Defendant KR Besh, Inc. is:

- 25 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
26 California;
- 27 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
28 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and



- 1 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
2 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
3 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
4 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

5 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
6 alleges, that Defendant RRA Besh, Inc. is:

- 7 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
8 California;
9 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
10 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
11 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
12 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
13 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
14 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

15 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
16 alleges, that Defendant KJ Beck's, Inc. is:

- 17 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
18 California;
19 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
20 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
21 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
22 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
23 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
24 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

25 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
26 alleges, that Defendant RLSR Beck's, Inc. is:

- 27 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
28 California;

- 1 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
2 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
3 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
4 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
5 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
6 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

7 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
8 alleges, that Defendant R.M Family Corporation, Inc. is:

- 9 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
10 California;
11 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
12 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
13 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
14 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
15 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
16 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

17 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
18 alleges, that Defendant Lucretia & Richard, Inc. is:

- 19 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
20 California;
21 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
22 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
23 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
24 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
25 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
26 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

27 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
28 alleges, that Defendant The Besh Restaurant Corporation is:



- 1 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
2 California;
- 3 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
4 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- 5 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
6 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
7 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
8 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

9 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
10 alleges, that Defendant RLB Family Corporation is:

- 11 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
12 California;
- 13 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
14 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- 15 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
16 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
17 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
18 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

19 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
20 alleges, that Defendant R. L. Besh, Inc. is:

- 21 (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in La Canada,
22 California;
- 23 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
24 State of California, including in Los Angeles; and
- 25 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
26 of the putative Class and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered
27 and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
28 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.



1 25. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or
2 entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such
3 fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the
4 damages suffered by Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein.
5 Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants
6 when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be
7 necessary.

8 26. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
9 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,
10 and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in
11 the State of California.

12 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times
13 each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff
14 and the other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over
15 their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
16 alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint
17 venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation,
18 successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and
19 was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore
20 such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct
21 with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges
22 that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above,
23 that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted,
24 approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

25 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

26 28. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Los
27 Angeles, State of California as a non-exempt employee during the statutory period. Plaintiff was
28



1 typically scheduled to work 5 days in a workweek, and typically in excess of 8 hours in a single
2 workday.

3 29. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
4 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
5 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
6 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all
7 final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to
8 furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience
9 working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

10 30. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
11 Employees worked more than 8 hours in a workday and more than 40 hours in a workweek.
12 Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff, the Class, and the
13 Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. In those instances
14 where Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees earned non-discretionary bonuses and
15 other remuneration, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the
16 correct overtime rate of pay, meal break premium rate of pay, rest break premium rate of pay,
17 and sick day rate of pay. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff, the Class, and the
18 Aggrieved Employees were required to work "off-the-clock" and uncompensated. For example,
19 Defendants only had one tablet for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to clock
20 in/out from and Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to wait in line to
21 clock in/out of their shifts without compensation. Additionally, Defendants required Plaintiff, the
22 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work outside of their scheduled hours, such as ordering
23 inventory for the store, and did not compensate them for those hours worked. In maintaining a
24 practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendants failed to maintain accurate records of the
25 hours Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

26 31. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
27 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods.
28 Defendants often required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess



1 of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted,
2 duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class,
3 and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth
4 hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff, the
5 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth
6 hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Plaintiff,
7 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were often required to work during their meal periods,
8 leading to the failure to provide uninterrupted meal periods. For example, Plaintiff, the Class,
9 and the Aggrieved Employees were required to prioritize urgent work tasks before starting their
10 meal periods or during their meal periods, resulting in late, shortened, interrupted, or missed meal
11 periods. Additionally, despite requiring Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to
12 remain on premises during meal periods and continue working through their meal periods,
13 Defendants instructed Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to falsify their time
14 records and clock out for their purported meal periods prior to the start of the sixth hour to reflect
15 a timely meal period had been taken. As a result, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
16 Employees were not provided with uninterrupted and complete meal periods. Accordingly,
17 Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff, the Class, and the
18 Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

19 32. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
20 and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest
21 periods. Defendants often required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work in
22 excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to
23 take a net 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or
24 major fraction thereof), or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
25 Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did not
26 adequately inform Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest
27 period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or
28 authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did



1 Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants
2 also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff, the Class, and the
3 Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not
4 maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot
5 demonstrate that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the
6 middle of each work period. For example, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
7 were required to prioritize their tasks before starting their rest periods or during their rest periods
8 resulting in late, shortened, interrupted, or missed rest periods. Additionally, Plaintiff, the Class,
9 and the Aggrieved Employees regularly missed their second rest periods completely. As a result,
10 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were rarely provided with compliant rest
11 periods and were regularly required to work through their rest periods. Accordingly, Defendants'
12 policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
13 Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

14 33. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff, the
15 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of
16 their duties for Defendants without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff, the Class, and the
17 Aggrieved Employees were required to use their personal cell phones for work purposes such as
18 communicating with co-workers and supervisors regarding work supplies. Additionally, Plaintiff,
19 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to use their own internet to order
20 inventory for the store outside of their scheduled hours. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
21 Employees were also required to purchase their own work supplies such as hair nets, pens, and
22 toilet paper. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were not adequately
23 compensated for these work-related expenses.

24 34. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
25 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all
26 wages for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period
27 premium wages. Further, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
28 Employees their final paychecks immediately upon termination.



1 35. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff, the Class,
2 and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable
3 hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages
4 earned for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that
5 were not provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were
6 not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's
7 address). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff, the
8 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 9 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
10 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
11 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
12 entitled;
- 13 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
14 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
15 though they had not been;
- 16 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid
17 minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages
18 at the correct California rate even though they were;
- 19 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
20 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
21 California rate even though they had not been;
- 22 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
23 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 24 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
25 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
26 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
27 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
28 statements contained the required accurate information;



- 1 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to
2 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,
3 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
4 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
5 rates to which Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were
6 entitled, and Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid
7 less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

8 Thus, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in
9 California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

10 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

11 36. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all
12 other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil
13 Procedure § 382.

14 37. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief
15 authorized by California law.

16 38. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

17 All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly, non-
18 exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before the
19 filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice of class
certification to the Class is sent.

20 39. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

21 40. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
22 conditions of all Class Members.

23 41. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is
24 readily ascertainable:

- 25 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
26 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
27 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
28 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the



identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.

(b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

(c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

(d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and
- 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California

1 is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through
2 a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their
3 rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are
4 also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former
5 employers might damage their future endeavors through negative
6 references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members
7 who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows
8 for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is
9 protected.

10 42. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if
11 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without
12 limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- 13 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum
14 wages, and overtime wages;
- 15 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to
16 Class Members;
- 17 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
18 wages to Class Members;
- 19 (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their
20 discharge or resignation;
- 21 (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked,
22 and all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
- 23 (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses;
24 and
- 25 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a
26 result of their illegal conduct as described above.

27 43. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
28 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:



- (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of:
- 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or
 - 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the class as a whole.



44. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked)

45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.

46. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

47. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiff and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

48. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

49. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

50. By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiff and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff and the Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiff and the Class, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.



1 51. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
2 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
3 compensation due Plaintiff and the Class.

4 52. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class are
5 entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay
6 minimum wages.

7 53. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with
8 all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period
9 applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month
10 at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times,
11 Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class all such wages due,
12 and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

13 54. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum
14 wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§
15 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

16 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

18 55. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
19 paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.

20 56. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
21 employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless
22 they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

23 57. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California
24 shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional
25 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
26 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed
27 by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

28 58. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight

1 hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

2 59. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class
3 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
4 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198. Plaintiff and the
5 Class are regularly required to work overtime hours.

6 60. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
7 compensation to the Plaintiff and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiff and the
8 Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently
9 unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be
10 ascertained according to proof at trial.

11 61. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
12 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
13 Plaintiff and the Class.

14 62. Plaintiff and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation according
15 to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a), as well
16 as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the
17 California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

18 63. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all
19 wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall
20 pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all
21 overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the
22 Class with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

23 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

25 64. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
26 paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.

27 65. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
28 Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the



1 start of Plaintiff and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal
2 periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the
3 California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer
4 provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a
5 violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any
6 employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

7 66. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff
8 and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit
9 and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact
10 that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),
11 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and
12 the applicable Wage Orders.

13 67. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
14 additional wages at the regular rate of pay for each workday he or she was not provided with all
15 required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

18 68. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
19 paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.

20 69. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of net 10
21 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction thereof (i.e. more than two
22 hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that the
23 employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for
24 each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten
25 minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so
26 required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of
27 the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest
28 period mandated under any Wage Order.



1 70. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the
2 Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than 4 hours in a
3 workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as
4 alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take
5 these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7
6 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

7 71. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
8 additional wages at the regular rate of pay for each workday he or she was not provided with all
9 required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

10 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)**

12 72. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
13 paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.

14 73. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by
15 failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff and the Class for their necessary expenditures and
16 losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to
17 directions of Defendants.

18 74. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of the
19 expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

20 75. Plaintiff and the class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and
21 costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code section
22 2802(b).

23 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time**
25 **Penalties)**

26 76. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
27 paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.



1 77. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
2 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
3 due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment,
4 his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter,
5 unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to
6 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

7 78. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many
8 other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the
9 employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and
10 continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be
11 paid by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within
12 seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

13 79. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those Class members who are no longer
14 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within
15 seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor
16 Code §§ 201 and 202.

17 80. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
18 wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall
19 continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is
20 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

21 81. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally
22 accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days
23 maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

24 82. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiff and the
25 Class are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs
26 incurred in this action.

27 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

28 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and**



Compliant Wage Records)

83. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.

84. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

85. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff and the Class, the failure to list the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

86. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

87. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

88. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants’ refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California’s Labor Code and



related laws and regulations.

89. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

90. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

91. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.

92. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

93. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

94. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

96. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the



1 California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California
2 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

3 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

4 97. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation
5 of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
6 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

7 **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked**

8 98. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance
9 with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or
10 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

11 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

12 99. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
13 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
14 and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

16 100. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
17 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes
18 unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

19 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

20 101. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
21 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
22 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§
23 17200, *et seq.*

24 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

25 102. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance
26 with California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
27 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

28 103. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices



1 described herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from
2 Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly
3 situated, of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

4 104. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
5 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

6 105. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled
7 to, and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
8 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived,
9 by means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff
10 and the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
11 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

12 106. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, is further
13 entitled to and does seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
14 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,
15 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
16 practices in the future.

17 107. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, has no
18 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
19 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
20 practices. As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
21 above, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and
22 will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained
23 from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

24 108. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
25 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
26 withholdings.

27 109. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff
28 and putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by

Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)

110. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 35 in this Complaint.

111. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

112. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

113. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. On February 27, 2025, she gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and certain current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee. Plaintiff's PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1082981-25.

114. More than 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil



1 action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of
2 the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to,
3 penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, and 2699(f)(2).

4 115. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor
5 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
6 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by
7 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
8 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee
9 begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be
10 recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall
11 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

12 116. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
13 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to
14 maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and
15 the Aggrieved Employees worked. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required
16 by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the
17 ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the
18 time they actually worked. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to
19 dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic
20 enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have
21 suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such
22 wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel
23 Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in
24 amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the
25 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also
26 suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the
27 wage payments paid to them.
28



1 117. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award
2 of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved
3 Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount
4 to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies
5 permitted by law.

6 118. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs
7 pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in
8 any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to
11 the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
12 follows:

13 **Class Certification**

- 14 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second,
15 Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;
16 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and
17 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

18 **As to the First Cause of Action**

- 19 4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
20 Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
21 minimum wages due;
22 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
23 6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
24 such amounts were due;
25 7. For liquidated damages;
26 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
27 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
28 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.



As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due;

11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Third Cause of Action

15. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be appropriate;

27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;

31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;

32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

39. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.



As to the Eighth Cause of Action

40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

41. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

42. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

44. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

46. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay all wages owed, including overtime, failure to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

47. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses, according to proof;

48. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*, and all other applicable Labor Code provisions;

49. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699; and,



1 50. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

2 As to all Causes of Action

3 51. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

4
5 Dated: May 6, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

6 THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC

7
8 By:



9 Seung L. Yang
10 Tiffany Hyun
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

20 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

21
22 Dated: May 6, 2025

THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC

23
24 By:



25 Seung L. Yang
26 Tiffany Hyun
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff



1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3)
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

5 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not
6 a party to the within action; the address from which I served the document listed below is 355 S
7 Grand Ave, Suite 1450, Los Angeles, California 90071. On May 6, 2025, I served the foregoing
8 document described as:

9 **FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION**
10 **COMPLAINT:**

11 by placing ☐ (the original) ☒ (a true copy thereof) in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:


12 ☒ **BY MAIL:** I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary
13 business practices. I am readily familiar with the practice of The Sentinel Law Firm, APC's
14 practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that
15 correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course
16 of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully
17 prepaid.

18 **O'HAGAN MEYER, LLP**
19 Attorneys for Defendants.
20 Justin Lee (jlee@ohaganmeyer.com)
21 Gouya Ranekouhi (granekouhi@ohaganmeyer.com)
22 4695 MacArthur Court, Suite 900
23 Newport Beach, CA 92660

24 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true
25 and correct.

26 Executed on May 6, 2025, at Los Angeles, California.

27 Karen Arellano

28 

Name

Signature