

February 12, 2025

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION ONLY TO:

<https://dir.tfaforms.net/128> (copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO
333 Bush St. Suite 2700
San Francisco, CA 94104
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 6453 7761 34

FHL BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO
333 Bush St. Suite 2700
San Francisco, CA 94104
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 6453 7712 83

LWDA No.:

**Re: Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* Penalties – PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA
Delgado v. Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, et al.
Superior Court for the County of San Francisco**

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiff APRIL DELGADO (“Plaintiff”) and other similarly situated aggrieved non-exempt, hourly employees (collectively “Aggrieved Employees”) for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226(b), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, 2926 and provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* (“the Act”). Plaintiff would like to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendant FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO, a business entity of unknown form, (“Defendant Federal Home Loan Bank”); Defendant FHL BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO, a business entity of unknown form, (“Defendant FHL Bank”); and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (collectively “Defendants”).



Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act, along with a copy of Plaintiff's Class Action Complaint, which is attached to this Notice letter. The Complaint is being concurrently filed in San Francisco County Superior Court and will be assigned a local case number. The Complaint allegations and claims are incorporated into this Notice Letter.

We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. The attached Class Action Complaint provides the details of Plaintiff's class-wide claims and claims under the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It, along with this Notice Letter, addresses in detail numerous violations that subjects Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt, hourly employee based out of Defendants' location in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as "Aggrieved Employees." Aggrieved Employees consistently worked at Defendants' behest and under their control and subject to their policies and practices without being paid all wages due. Plaintiff is also informed and believes that there are other Aggrieved Employees employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees within the state of California within the statutory time period who suffer or suffered from the same wage and hour violations outlined below.

Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. Aggrieved Employees were either not paid by Defendants for all hours worked or were not paid at the appropriate minimum, regular and overtime rates. Plaintiff also contends that Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages due and owing, including by requiring off the clock work, failing to provide meal and rest breaks, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to timely pay wages including final wages, failing to maintain accurate records, and making unlawful deductions all in violation of various provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

During the course of Aggrieved Employees' employment with Defendants, Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed resulting in off the clock work. Aggrieved Employees were required to perform pre-shift and post-shift off the clock work which they were not compensated for despite being subject to Defendants' control. For instance, Plaintiff was required to set up, get deliveries and communicate with the team prior to clocking in. Upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were also required to perform similar off the clock work. Furthermore, Aggrieved Employees were required to work through portions of their meal periods while they were off the clock and were not paid for this time. Defendants also contacted Aggrieved Employees on their personal cell phones with work demands outside of scheduled work hours, and Aggrieved Employees were not paid for this time.



By implementing policies, programs, practices, procedures and protocols which resulted in off the clock work, Defendants' willful actions resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages and overtime pay to Aggrieved Employees. For example, the off the clock work addressed above caused Aggrieved Employees to begin receiving overtime pay later than they should have.

As a result of the above-described requirements to work off the clock, Aggrieved Employees were not properly paid all wages earned and all wages owed to them by Defendants, including when working more than eight (8) hours in any given day and/or more than forty (40) hours in any given week. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above, was worked by Aggrieved Employees in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

Additionally, Defendants failed to provide all the legally required unpaid, off-duty meal periods and all the legally required paid, off-duty rest periods to Aggrieved Employees, as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work as ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during a shift but were often required to do so without receiving a lawful and timely meal break. In addition to untimely meal periods, Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to respond to work demands. Defendants placed their needs over Aggrieved Employees' lawful meal and rest breaks, and this resulted in Aggrieved Employees often having to work through their scheduled meal and/or rest breaks, or otherwise taking shortened ones, because the demands of the job would not avail them the opportunity to take a lawfully uninterrupted and off duty meal and/or rest break.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees worked over 10 hours in a shift, Defendants also failed to provide them with a second, uninterrupted, timely and duty-free meal period. As a result, Defendants' failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with all legally required off-duty, unpaid meal periods and all the legally required off-duty, paid rest periods is and will be evidenced by Defendants' business records, or lack thereof. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective hourly rate of pay, for each meal period or rest break that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

Therefore, Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five (5) hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes, and shifts in excess of (10) hours without providing them with second meal periods of not less than thirty minutes; nor did Defendants pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective hourly rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

Aggrieved Employees were also not authorized and permitted to take lawful rest periods, were systematically required by Defendants to work through or during breaks and were not provided with one (1) hour's wages in lieu thereof. Aggrieved Employees were restricted in their ability to take their full ten (10) minutes net rest time or were otherwise not provided with duty-free rest periods. Therefore, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid



rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours; or major fraction thereof, nor did Defendant pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided.

Defendants also consistently failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226(a). Specifically, Labor Code § 226(a)(8) requires wage statements to include the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer. The wage statements provided to Aggrieved Employees failed to include the correct name of the legal entity that is the employer. Thus, the wage statements Defendants provided to Aggrieved Employees do not comply with Labor Code § 226(a)(8). Moreover, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees contain unlawful deductions by Defendants. Further, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages and overtime because Defendants under-reported Aggrieved Employees' actual hours worked due to the off the clock work. Additionally, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks. Thus, the wage statements do not provide accurate hourly rates for overtime and the statements do not comply with Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

Additionally, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages owed, as detailed above, at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as required under Labor Code § 203. Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all regular and overtime wages because Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked by requiring off the clock work. Additionally, Defendants failed to pay premium wages owed for unprovided meal periods and rest periods. Defendants' failure to pay said wages within the required time was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

Defendants also had a common policy and/or practice of unlawfully collecting or deducting wages from Aggrieved Employees. Defendants unlawfully removed wages for overpayment that Aggrieved Employees never agreed to in violation of Labor Code § 221. Defendants' common policy and/or practice of understating the hours worked by Aggrieved Employees has given rise to further ongoing violations of Labor Code § 221.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above and in further detail in the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states, "[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful." The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.



In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines “Hours Worked” as “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.” Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states: “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: “Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit.”

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.

During the course of Aggrieved Employees’ employment with Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed resulting in off the clock work. Aggrieved Employees were required to perform pre-shift and post-shift off the clock work which they were not compensated for despite being subject to Defendants’ control. For instance, Plaintiff was required to set up, get deliveries and communicate with the team prior to clocking in. Upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were also required to perform similar off the clock work. Furthermore, Aggrieved Employees were required to work through portions of their meal periods while they were off the clock and were not paid for this time. Defendants also contacted Aggrieved Employees on their personal cell phones with work demands outside of scheduled work hours, and Aggrieved Employees were not paid for this time.

During the relevant time period, Defendants thus regularly failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, including by requiring systematic off the clock work. Defendants’ uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the Aggrieved Employees as a whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy



and practice that denied accurate compensation to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees as to minimum wage pay.

In light of the foregoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime and double time. Specifically, Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including hours at their required regular, overtime, and double-time rates. Defendants, and each of them, have intentionally and improperly required Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock to avoid paying Aggrieved Employees all earned and owed straight time and overtime wages and other benefits.

Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above and by under-reporting actual hours worked. With work shifts generally requiring eight hours or more of work on a given day, this unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved



Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours or twelve hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring Plaintiff and other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty minutes as required under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and paragraph 11 of the applicable Wage Orders. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were forced to incur shortened meal periods, were provided with meal breaks late and well after the fifth hour of work, or could not be relieved to take breaks, or were required to remain on-duty at all times and were unable to take off-duty breaks or were otherwise not provided with the opportunity to take required breaks.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees were provided with a meal period, it was often untimely or interrupted by having to respond to work demands or remain under Defendant's control, in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. On shifts over ten hours, second meal periods were not provided. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment



of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions. Defendants also miscalculated the rate at which they paid any meal period or rest period premiums when Defendant did attempt to pay them, resulting in further violations of section 226.7.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Specifically, Defendants provided rest periods untimely or for shortened durations, and Defendants' policies and procedures required Aggrieved Employees to remain under Defendants' control during breaks to respond to job requirements.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.



Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Any wage statements given to Employees by Defendants necessarily failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay, including by failing to pay for all hours worked, failure to pay for all overtime hours worked or at the correct rate of pay, for providing deficient meal periods and rest breaks, all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to the Employees, as alleged above. Further, Labor Code § 226(a)(8) requires wage statements to include the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer. The wage statements provided to Aggrieved Employees failed to include the correct name of the legal entity that is the employer. Thus, the wage statements Defendants provided to Aggrieved Employees do not comply with Labor Code § 226(a)(8). Moreover, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees contain unlawful deductions by Defendants.

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ..."

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work



shift and a workday, or miscalculated these premiums by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants' systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code § 204 and § 226.

Given the above described off the clock work and unlawful deductions, Plaintiff was not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours she worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and that she was not paid all double time owed either. Defendants' uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, and off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by employees and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, premium pay, etc., and by not recording meal period start and end times, all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours



worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination or within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unlawfully Collecting or Receiving Wages in Violation of Labor Code § 221

Labor Code § 221 provides, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee." As discussed above, Defendants have consistently violated Labor Code § 221 by unlawfully collecting or deducting the Employees' earned wages. Defendants also had a common policy and/or practice of unlawfully collecting or deducting wages from Aggrieved Employees. As discussed above, Defendants unlawfully received and/or collected wages from Aggrieved Employees by implementing a policy of automatically deducting wages for overpayment that Aggrieved Employees never agreed to in violation of Labor Code § 221. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558. Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.



Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

Plaintiff's PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226(b), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2926, including as follows:

(a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving



rise to civil penalties under Labor Code §226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to “a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...”;

(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(e) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5, and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

We have been constrained to initially move forward with the filing of this Complaint, alleging the causes of action discussed herein, without the PAGA claim. Thus, any action by the LWDA would not resolve the entirety of the case, and the interest of judicial economy will be served by allowing the case to proceed as a cohesive whole.

This letter and the attached Complaint therefore provide the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Defendant FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO, Defendant FHL BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO, and any other named Defendants and joint employers. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants’ employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

David Yerejian



Cc: FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO; FHL BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO; by Certified Mail

D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
Natalie Haritounian (SBN 324318)
n.haritounian@d.law
Andrea A. Amaya Silva (SBN 348080)
a.amaya@d.law
450 N Brand Blvd, Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff APRIL DELGADO
on behalf of herself and others similarly situated

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

APRIL DELGADO, an individual on behalf
of herself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OF SAN
FRANCISCO, a business entity of unknown
form; FHL BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO, a
business entity of unknown form; and DOES
1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

CLASS ACTION

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
2. Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Under Labor Code § 510;
3. Meal Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
4. Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
5. Violation of Labor Code § 226(a);
6. Violation of Labor Code § 203;
7. Violation of Labor Code § 204;
8. Violation of Labor Code § 221;
9. Failure to Keep Required Payroll Records under Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5; and
10. Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. Plaintiff APRIL DELGADO (“Plaintiff”) brings this action on behalf of herself and
3 the Class Members who are defined as “all current and former employees within the State of
4 California who, at any time from four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, are or were
5 employed as non-exempt hourly employees by Defendant FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OF
6 SAN FRANCISCO, a business entity of unknown form (“Defendant Federal Home Loan Bank”);
7 and/or FHL BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO, a business entity of unknown form (“Defendant FHL
8 Bank”); and/or DOES 1 through 50, inclusive” (all Defendants being collectively referred to herein
9 as “Defendants”).

10 2. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of them, violated various provisions of the
11 California Labor Code, relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC), and the
12 California Business & Professions Code, and seeks redress for these violations.

13 3. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and (1) shared
14 similar job duties and responsibilities; (2) was subjected to the same policies and practices; and (3)
15 endured similar violations at the hands of Defendants as the other Class Members who served in
16 similar and related positions.

17 **THE PARTIES**

18 **A. The Plaintiff**

19 4. Plaintiff APRIL DELGADO resides in California, during the time period relevant to
20 this Complaint, and was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee within the State
21 of California.

22 **B. The Defendants**

23 5. Defendant FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO (“Defendant
24 Federal Home Loan Bank”) is a business entity of unknown form. Defendant Federal Home Loan
25 Bank has been the employer listed on the employment records issued to Plaintiff during the relevant
26 time period that Plaintiff was employed with Defendants. Defendant Federal Home Loan Bank
27 employs Plaintiff and the Class Members in California, including at Defendants’ offices and
28 facilities in San Francisco, California, and throughout California, and conducts business throughout

1 California.

2 6. Defendant FHL BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO (“Defendant FHL Bank”) is a
3 business entity of unknown form. Defendant FHL Bank has been the employer listed on the
4 employment records issued to Plaintiff during the relevant time period that Plaintiff was employed
5 with Defendants. Defendant FHL Bank employs Plaintiff and the Class Members in California,
6 including at Defendants’ offices and facilities in San Francisco, California, and throughout
7 California, and conducts business throughout California.

8 7. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or whatever
9 else, of the Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are currently unknown to
10 Plaintiff, who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil
11 Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants designated
12 herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, are legally responsible in some manner
13 for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to
14 reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated herein as Does 1 through 50 when
15 their identities become known.

16 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted in
17 all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, that Defendants carried out
18 a joint scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and that the acts of each
19 Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants acted in all
20 respects as the employers or joint employers of Class Members. Defendants, and each of them,
21 exercised control over the wages, hours or working conditions of Class Members, or suffered or
22 permitted Class Members to work, or engaged, thereby creating a common law employment
23 relationship, with Class Members. Therefore, Defendants, and each of them, employed or jointly
24 employed Class Members.

25 9. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act by a
26 Defendant or Defendants, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to mean the acts and
27 failures to act of each Defendant acting individually, jointly, and severally.

28 10. Whenever and wherever reference is made to individuals who are not named as a

1 Defendant in this Complaint but were agents, servants, employees and/or supervisors of Defendants,
2 such individuals at all relevant times acted on behalf of Defendants within the scope of their
3 employment.

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 11. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
6 Procedure § 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code § 17203. This Action is brought as
7 a Class Action on behalf of similarly situated Class Members of Defendants pursuant to California
8 Code of Civil Procedure § 382. Venue as to Defendants is also proper in this judicial district pursuant
9 to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395 *et seq.* Upon information and belief, the obligations and
10 liabilities giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in part in San Francisco County. Defendants maintain
11 and operate facilities in San Francisco County and employs Plaintiff and other Class Members in
12 San Francisco County, while doing business throughout California.

13 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

14 12. Class Members consistently worked at Defendants behest without being paid all
15 wages due. Class Members were either not paid by Defendants for all hours worked or were not
16 paid at the appropriate minimum, regular and overtime rates. Plaintiff also contends that Defendants
17 failed to pay Class Members all wages due and owing, including by requiring off the clock work,
18 failing to provide meal and rest breaks, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to timely
19 pay wages including final wages, failing to maintain accurate records, and making unlawful
20 deductions all in violation of various provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage
21 Orders.

22 13. During the course of Class Members' employment with Defendants, Class Members
23 were not paid all wages they were owed. Class Members were required to perform pre-shift and
24 post-shift off the clock work which they were not compensated for despite being subject to
25 Defendants' control. Specifically, Plaintiff was required to set up, get deliveries and communicate
26 with the team prior to clocking in. Upon information and belief, Class Members were also required
27 to perform similar off the clock work. Furthermore, Class Members were required to work through
28 portions of their meal periods while they were off the clock and were not paid for this time.

1 Defendants also contacted Class Members on their personal cell phones with work demands outside
2 of scheduled work hours, and Class Members were not paid for this time.

3 14. By implementing policies, programs, practices, procedures and protocols which
4 resulted in off the clock work, Defendants' willful actions resulted in the systematic underpayment
5 of wages to Class Members, including underpayment of overtime pay to Class Members over the
6 relevant time period. For example, the above described off the clock work caused Plaintiff and Class
7 Members to begin receiving overtime pay later than they should have.

8 15. As a result of the above-described requirements to work off the clock, Class
9 Members were not properly paid all wages earned and all wages owed to them by Defendants,
10 including when working more than eight (8) hours in any given day and/or more than forty (40)
11 hours in any given week.

12 16. As a result of Defendants' unlawful policies and practices, Class Members incurred
13 overtime hours worked for which they were not adequately and completely compensated, in addition
14 to the hours they were required to work off the clock. To the extent applicable, Defendants also
15 failed to pay Class Members at an overtime rate of 1.5 times the regular rate for the first eight hours
16 of the seventh consecutive work day in a week and overtime payments at the rate of 2 times the
17 regular rate for hours worked over eight (8) on the seventh consecutive work day, as required under
18 the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders.

19 17. Therefore, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing
20 to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Class Members for
21 all hours worked, and failing to pay minimum wages for all time worked, as required by California
22 law. Defendants thus failed to pay Class Members at least minimum wages for all the time they
23 worked for Defendants in violation of the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders as the
24 actual times when Class Members were under the control and direction of Defendants was under
25 reported in the hours reflected on the timekeeping records. Furthermore, Defendants' willful actions
26 resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages to Class Members, including underpayment of
27 overtime pay to Class Members over a period of time.

28 18. Therefore, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing

1 to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Class Members for
2 all hours worked. Also, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing
3 to the present, Defendants also had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Class Members
4 their true and correct overtime compensation at premium overtime rates for all hours worked in
5 excess of eight (8) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, and double-time rates for all hours
6 worked in excess of twelve (12) hours a day, in violation of Labor Code § 510 and the corresponding
7 sections of IWC Wage Orders.

8 19. Additionally, Defendants failed to provide all the legally required unpaid, off-duty
9 meal periods and all the legally required paid, off-duty rest periods to Class Members, as required
10 by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. Class Members were required to perform work as
11 ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during a shift but were often required to do so
12 without receiving a lawful and timely meal break. In addition to untimely meal periods, Defendants
13 also required Class Members to respond to work demands. Defendants placed their needs over Class
14 Members lawful meal and rest breaks, and this resulted in Class Members often having to work
15 through their scheduled meal and/or rest breaks, or otherwise taking shortened ones, because the
16 demands of the job would not avail them the opportunity to take a lawfully uninterrupted and off
17 duty meal and/or rest break.

18 20. On the occasions when Class Members worked over 10 hours in a shift, Defendants
19 also failed to provide them with a second, uninterrupted, timely and duty-free meal period. As a
20 result, Defendants' failure to provide Class Members with all legally required off-duty, unpaid meal
21 periods and all the legally required off-duty, paid rest periods is and will be evidenced by
22 Defendants' business records, or lack thereof. Defendants also failed to pay Class Members
23 "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Class Member's effective hourly rate of pay, for each
24 meal period or rest break that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

25 21. Therefore, for at least four years prior to the filing of this action and through to the
26 present, Defendants have regularly required Class Members to work shifts in excess of five (5) hours
27 without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes, and
28 shifts in excess of (10) hours without providing them with second meal periods of not less than thirty

minutes; nor did Defendants pay Class Members “premium pay,” i.e. one hour of wages at each Class Member’s effective hourly rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

22. Meal period violations thus occurred in one or more of the following manners:

- (a) Class Members were not provided full thirty-minute duty free meal periods for work days in excess of five (5) hours and were not compensated one (1) hour’s wages in lieu thereof, all in violation of, among others, Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s);
- (b) Class Members were not provided second full thirty-minute duty free meal periods for work days in excess of ten (10) hours;
- (c) Class Members were required to work through at least part of their daily meal period(s);
- (d) Meal periods were provided after five (5) hours of continuous work during a shift; and
- (e) Class Members were restricted in their ability to take a full thirty-minute meal period.

23. Class Members were also not authorized and permitted to take lawful rest periods, were systematically required by Defendants to work through or during breaks and were not provided with one (1) hour’s wages in lieu thereof. Class Members were restricted in their ability to take their full ten (10) minutes net rest time or were otherwise not provided with duty-free rest periods. Therefore, from at least four years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Class Members with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours; or major fraction thereof, nor did Defendant pay Class Members premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided.

24. Rest period violations therefore arose in one or more of the following manners:

- (a) Class Members were required to work without being provided a minimum

1 ten (10) minute rest period for every four (4) hours or major fraction
2 thereof worked and were not compensated one (1) hour of pay at their
3 regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not
4 provided;

5 (b) Class Members were not authorized and permitted to take timely rest
6 periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof; and

7 (c) Class Members were required to remain on-duty during rest periods or
8 otherwise had their rest periods interrupted by work demands.

9 25. Defendants also consistently failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements as
10 required by Labor Code § 226(a). Specifically, Labor Code § 226(a)(8) requires wage statements to
11 include the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer. The wage statements provided
12 to Class Members failed to include the correct name of the legal entity that is the employer. Thus,
13 the wage statements Defendants provided to Class Members do not comply with Labor Code §
14 226(a)(8). Moreover, the wage statements given to Class Members contain unlawful deductions by
15 Defendants. Further, the wage statements given to Class Members failed to accurately account for
16 unpaid wages and overtime because Defendants under-reported Class Members' actual hours
17 worked due to the off the clock work. Additionally, the wage statements given to Class Members
18 failed to accurately account for premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks.
19 Thus, the wage statements do not provide accurate hourly rates for overtime and the statements do
20 not comply with Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

21 26. From at least four (4) years prior to filing this lawsuit and continuing to the present,
22 Defendants have thus also had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages owed to Class Members
23 at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as required by
24 California wage-and-hour laws. Specifically, Class Members were not paid all regular and overtime
25 wages because Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked by requiring off the clock work.
26 Additionally, Defendants failed to pay premium wages owed for unprovided meal periods and rest
27 periods, as further detailed in this Complaint. Defendants' failure to pay said wages within the
28 required time was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

27. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently and unlawfully collected or received wages from Class Members. Defendants made payments of wages to Class Members via direct deposit into their personal bank accounts. However, Defendants unlawfully removed and made deductions of said wages from Class Members' pay without permission and authorization.

28. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff and Class Members bring this action pursuant to, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2926 and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11000 *et seq.*

29. Furthermore, pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-17208, Plaintiff and the Class Members seek injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendants have enjoyed from their violations of Labor Code and the other unfair, unlawful, or fraudulent practices alleged in this Complaint.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

30. Plaintiff seeks to represent the Subclasses composed of and defined as follows:

a. Subclass 1. Minimum Wages Subclass. All Class Members who were not compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the applicable minimum wage.

b. Subclass 2. Wages and Overtime Subclass. All Class Members who were not compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the required rates of pay, including for all hours worked in excess of eight in a day and/or forty in a week.

c. Subclass 3. Meal Period Subclass. All Class Members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to provide unpaid 30-minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal periods or one hour of pay at the Class Member's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

d. Subclass 4. Rest Break Subclass. All Class Members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to authorize and permit Class Members to take uninterrupted, duty-free, 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof, and failing to pay one hour of pay at the Class Member's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

e. Subclass 5. Wage Statement Subclass. All Class Members who, within the

applicable limitations period, were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

f. Subclass 6. Termination Pay Subclass. All Class Members who, within the applicable limitations period, either voluntarily or involuntarily separated from their employment and were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to timely pay wages upon termination.

g. Subclass 7: Failure to Timely Pay Wages Twice Monthly Subclass. All Class Members who were subject to Defendants' policy and practice of not timely paying all wages earned when they were due and payable at least twice monthly.

h. Subclass 8. Payroll Records Subclass. All Class Members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to keep accurate time and wage records as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

i. Subclass 9. Unauthorized Deductions from Wages Subclass. All Class Members who were subject to Defendant' policy and/or practice of automatically deducting wages from Employees' pay.

j. Subclass 10. UCL Subclass. All Class Members who are owed restitution as a result of Defendants' business acts and practices, to the extent such acts and practices are found to be unlawful, deceptive, and/or unfair.

31. Plaintiff reserves the right under California Rule of Court 3.765 to amend or modify the class description with greater particularity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the Class against Defendants, the Class Period should be adjusted accordingly.

32. Defendants, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and willfully, engaged in a practice whereby Defendants failed to correctly calculate compensation for the time worked by Class Members, even though Defendants enjoyed the benefit of this work, required Class Members to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work. Defendants have uniformly denied these Class Members wages to which these employees are entitled and failed to provide meal

1 periods or authorize and permit rest periods, in order to unfairly cheat the competition and
2 unlawfully profit.

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

6 **A. Numerosity**

7 34. The potential members of the class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all the
8 member of the class is impracticable. While the precise number of Class Members has not been
9 determined at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants employ, or during the
10 time period relevant to this lawsuit, employed hundreds of employees who satisfy the Class
11 definition within the State of California.

12 35. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant time period increases this
13 number substantially. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' employment records will provide
14 information as to the number and location of all Class Members.

15 **B. Commonality**

16 36. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class that predominates over any
17 questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common questions of law and fact
18 include:

- 19 a. Whether Defendants failed to pay Class Members minimum wages;
- 20 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay Class Members wages for all hours worked;
- 21 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay Class Members overtime as required under Labor
22 Code § 510;
- 23 d. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the applicable
24 IWC Wage Orders, by failing to provide Class Members with requisite meal
25 periods or premium pay in lieu thereof;
- 26 e. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, and the applicable IWC Wage
27 Orders, by failing to authorize and permit Class Members to take requisite rest
28 breaks or provide premium pay in lieu thereof;

- 1 f. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226(a) by providing Class Members
2 with inaccurate wage statements;
- 3 g. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by failing to pay
4 wages and compensation due and owing at the time of termination of employment;
- 5 h. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful;
- 6 i. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226 and § 1174 and the IWC Wage
7 Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of Class Members' earned wages and
8 work periods;
- 9 j. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 1194 by failing to compensate all Class
10 Members during the relevant time period for all hours worked, whether regular or
11 overtime;
- 12 k. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 204 by failing to timely pay wages;
- 13 l. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 221;
- 14 m. Whether Defendants violated Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; and
- 15 n. Whether Class Members are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to Business and
16 Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

17 **C. Typicality**

18 37. The claims of the named Plaintiff is typical of those of Class Members. The Class
19 Members all sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common
20 course of conduct in violation of statutes, as well as regulations that have the force and effect of law,
21 as alleged herein.

22 **D. Adequacy of Representation**

23 38. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of the Class
24 Members. Counsel who represents Class Members are experienced and competent in litigating
25 employment class actions.

26 **E. Superiority of Class Action**

27 39. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient
28 adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Class Members is not practicable, and

1 questions of law and fact common to all Class Members predominate over any questions affecting
2 only individual Class Members. Each Class Member has been damaged and is entitled to recovery
3 by reason of Defendants' illegal policies or practices of failing to compensate Class Members
4 properly.

5 40. As to the issues raised in this case, a class action is superior to all other methods for
6 the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, as joinder of all Class Members is
7 impracticable and many legal and factual questions to be adjudicated apply uniformly to all Class
8 Members. Further, as the economic or other loss suffered by vast numbers of Class Members may
9 be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual actions makes it difficult for the Class
10 Members to individually redress the wrongs they have suffered. Moreover, in the event
11 disgorgement is ordered, a class action is the only mechanism that will permit the employment of a
12 fluid fund recovery to ensure that equity is achieved. There will be relatively little difficulty in
13 managing this case as a class action, and proceeding on a class-wide basis will permit Class
14 Members to vindicate their rights for violations they endured which they would otherwise be
15 foreclosed from receiving in a multiplicity of individual lawsuits that would be cost prohibitive to
16 them.

17 41. Class action treatment will allow those persons similarly situated to litigate their
18 claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.
19 Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties in managing this case that should preclude class treatment.
20 Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed Class Members that would set
21 forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own business records can be
22 utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that
23 any further notice is required, additional media and/or mailings can be used.

24 42. Defendants, as prospective and actual employers of the Class Members, had a special
25 fiduciary duty to disclose to prospective Class Members the true facts surrounding Defendants' pay
26 practices, policies and working conditions imposed upon Class Members as well as the effect of any
27 alleged arbitration agreements that may have been forced upon them. In addition, Defendants knew
28 they possessed special knowledge about pay practices and policies, most notably intentionally

1 refusing to pay for all hours actually worked which should have been recorded in Defendants' pay
2 records and the consequence of the alleged arbitration agreements and policies and practices on
3 Class Members.

4 43. Class Members did not discover the fact that they were entitled to all pay under the
5 Labor Code until shortly before the filing of this lawsuit nor was there ever any discussion about
6 Plaintiff's and the Class's waiver of their Constitutional rights of trial by jury, right to collectively
7 organize and oppose unlawful pay practices under California law as well as obtain injunctive relief
8 preventing such practices from continuing. As a result, the applicable statutes of limitation were
9 tolled until such time as Plaintiff and the Class Members discovered their claims.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 44. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
14 full herein.

15 45. Defendants failed to pay Class Members minimum wages for all hours worked.
16 Defendants had a consistent policy of misstating Class Members' time records and failing to pay
17 Class Members for all hours worked. Class Members would work hours and not receive wages,
18 including as alleged above in connection with off the clock work. Defendants, and each of them,
19 have intentionally and improperly changed, adjusted and/or modified the hours of Class Members,
20 which resulted in off the clock work and underpayment of all wages owed to Class Members over
21 a period of time, while benefiting Defendants. During the relevant time period, Defendants thus
22 regularly failed to pay minimum wages to Class Members, to their detriment. Additionally,
23 Defendants had a consistent policy of failing to pay Class Members for hours worked during alleged
24 meal and rest periods for which Class Members were consistently denied, as also addressed herein.
25 Defendants' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation,
26 applicable to the Class as a whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that
27 denied accurate compensation to Class Members as to minimum wage pay.

28 46. In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum

1 wage for all hours worked. (IWC Wage Order MW-2014). Additionally, pursuant to California
2 Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must
3 timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

4 47. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states:
5 “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to
6 employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.”

7 48. The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the
8 relevant period is found in Paragraph 4(A)-4(D) of the IWC Wage Orders.

9 49. The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private
10 civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: “Notwithstanding any agreement to
11 work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
12 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid
13 balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest
14 thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit.”

15 50. As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages
16 incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also,
17 California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
18 Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for
19 all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate and no part of this rate may
20 be used as a credit against a minimum wage obligation.

21 51. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, Defendants
22 inaccurately recorded, or required Class Members to input times that did not reflect their actual
23 hours worked, or calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
24 worked by Class Members. Defendants acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned
25 wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare
26 Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations. As a result of these violations,
27 Defendant also failed to timely pay all wages earned in accordance with California Labor Code §
28 1194.

1 52. California Labor Code § 1194.2 also provides for the following remedies: “In any
2 action under Section 1194 . . . to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the
3 minimum wages fixed by an order of the commission, an employee shall be entitled to recover
4 liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.”

5 53. In addition to restitution for all unpaid wages, pursuant to California Labor Code §
6 1197.1, Class Members are entitled to recover a penalty of \$100.00 for the initial failure to timely
7 pay each employee minimum wages, and \$250.00 for each subsequent failure to pay each employee
8 minimum wages.

9 54. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Class Members are further entitled to
10 recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

11 55. Defendants have the ability to pay minimum wages for all time worked and have
12 willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this
13 indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Class Members.

14 56. Wherefore, Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages
15 (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages
16 unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit pursuant to
17 California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiff and the other members of the Class further request
18 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment
19 of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code,
20 including § 558, and/or other applicable statutes.

21 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES AND OVERTIME UNDER LABOR CODE § 510**

23 **(Against All Defendants)**

24 57. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
25 full herein.

26 58. California Labor Code § 1194 provides that “any employee receiving less than the
27 legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to
28 recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime

1 compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit." The action
2 may be maintained directly against the employer in an employee's name without first filing a claim
3 with the Division of Labor Standards and Enforcement.

4 59. By their conduct, as set forth herein, Defendants violated California Labor Code §
5 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Class Members:
6 (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a
7 workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any workweek or for the first eight (8) hours worked on
8 the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked
9 in excess of twelve (12) hours in any one (1) day or for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours
10 on any seventh day of work in a workweek.

11 60. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Class Members wages for all hours
12 worked, including by requiring off the clock work, as addressed above. Defendants, and each of
13 them, have intentionally and improperly rounded, changed, adjusted, and/or modified certain
14 employees' hours, including Plaintiff's, in order to avoid paying Class Members all earned and owed
15 straight time and overtime wages and other benefits, in violation of the California Labor Code, the
16 California Code of Regulations and the IWC Wage Orders and guidelines set forth by the Division
17 of Labor Standards and Enforcement. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring
18 Class Members to work through portions of their meal period. Therefore, Class Members were not
19 properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours
20 in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Based on information and belief, Defendants did
21 not make available to Class Members a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Class
22 Members worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries.

23 61. Defendants' failure to pay Class Members the unpaid balance of regular wages owed
24 and overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of Labor Code
25 §§ 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

26 62. Additionally, Labor Code § 558(a) provides "any employer or other person acting on
27 behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any
28 provisions regulating hours and days of work in any order of the IWC shall be subject to a civil

1 penalty as follows: (1) For any violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each
2 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover
3 underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
4 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount
5 sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to
6 the affected employee.” Labor Code § 558(c) states, “the civil penalties provided for in this section
7 are in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty provided by law.” Defendants have violated
8 provisions of the Labor Code regulating hours and days of work as well as the IWC Wage Orders.
9 Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class Members seek the remedies set forth in Labor Code § 558.

10 63. Defendants’ failure to pay compensation in a timely fashion also constituted a
11 violation of California Labor Code § 204, which requires that all wages shall be paid semimonthly.
12 From four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit to the present, in direct violation of that
13 provision of the California Labor Code, Defendants have failed to pay all wages and overtime
14 compensation earned by Class Members. Each such failure to make a timely payment of
15 compensation to Class Members constitutes a separate violation of California Labor Code § 204.

16 64. Class Members have been damaged by these violations of California Labor Code §§
17 204 and 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission).

18 65. Consequently, pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204,
19 510, 558, and 1194, and the applicable IWC Wage Order, paragraph 3(A) and 4(B), Defendants are
20 liable to Class Members for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation,
21 with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any
22 statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by
23 the Labor Code and/or other statutes.

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **MEAL-PERIOD LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 66. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
28 full herein.

1 67. Class Members regularly worked shifts greater than five (5) hours and in some
2 instances, greater than ten (10) hours. Pursuant to Labor Code § 512 an employer may not employ
3 someone for a shift of more than five (5) hours without providing him or her with a meal period of
4 not less than thirty (30) minutes or for a shift of more than ten (10) hours without providing him or
5 her with a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

6 68. Defendants failed to provide Class Members with meal periods as required under the
7 Labor Code. Defendants placed their needs over Class Members lawful meal breaks and this resulted
8 in Class Members consistently having to work through their scheduled meal breaks because the
9 demands of the job would not avail them the opportunity to take a lawfully uninterrupted and off-
10 duty meal break. Furthermore, upon information and belief, on the occasions when Class Members
11 worked more than ten (10) hours in a given shift, they did so without receiving a second
12 uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period as required by law.

13 69. Defendants thus failed to provide Class Members with meal periods as required by
14 the Labor Code, including by not providing them with the opportunity to take meal breaks, by
15 providing them late or for less than thirty (30) minutes, or by requiring them to perform work during
16 breaks.

17 70. Moreover, Defendants failed to compensate Class Members for each meal period not
18 provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraph 11 of the
19 applicable IWC Wage Orders, which provide that, if an employer fails to provide an employee a
20 meal period in accordance with this section, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of
21 pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not
22 provided. Defendants failed to compensate Class Members for each meal period not provided or
23 inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7.

24 71. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order,
25 paragraph 11, Class Members are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages
26 at their effective hourly rates of pay for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, a
27 sum to be proven at trial, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants,
28 and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and other statutes.

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **REST-BREAK LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 72. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
5 full herein.

6 73. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and paragraph 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provide
7 that employers must authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods at the rate of ten (10)
8 minutes net rest time per four (4) work hours.

9 74. Class Members consistently worked consecutive four (4) hour shifts and were
10 generally scheduled for shifts of greater than 3.5 hours total, thus requiring Defendants to authorize
11 and permit them to take rest periods. Pursuant to the Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage
12 Order, Class Members were entitled to paid rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes for each
13 consecutive four (4) hour shift, and Defendants failed to provide Class Members with timely rest
14 breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes for each consecutive four (4) hour shift. Defendants placed
15 their needs over Class Members lawful rest breaks, and this resulted in Class Members consistently
16 having to work through their scheduled rest breaks because the demands of the job would not avail
17 them the opportunity to take a lawfully uninterrupted and off-duty rest break. Thus, Class Members
18 were consistently denied of their rest breaks.

19 75. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and paragraph 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provide
20 that if an employer fails to provide an employee rest period in accordance with this section, the
21 employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation
22 for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

23 76. Defendants, and each of them, have therefore intentionally and improperly denied
24 rest periods to Class Members in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and paragraph 12 of the
25 applicable IWC Wage Orders.

26 77. Defendants failed to authorize and permit Class Members to take rest periods, as
27 required by the Labor Code. Moreover, Defendants did not compensate Class Members with an
28 additional hour of pay at each Class Member's effective hourly rate for each day that Defendants

1 failed to provide them with adequate rest breaks, as required under Labor Code § 226.7.

2 78. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraph 12 of the applicable IWC
3 Wage Orders, Class Members are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages
4 at their effective hourly rates of pay for each day worked without the required rest breaks, a sum to
5 be proven at trial, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each
6 of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.

7 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226(a)**

9 **(Against All Defendants)**

10 79. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
11 full herein.

12 80. California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each of his or her
13 employees with an accurate, itemized statement in writing showing the gross and net earnings, total
14 hours worked, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; these statements
15 must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay
16 the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be
17 given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give
18 the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid.

19 81. Defendants failed to provide Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements
20 in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, Labor Code § 226(a)(8) requires wage
21 statements to include the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer. The wage
22 statements provided to Class Members failed to include the correct name of the legal entity that is
23 the employer. Thus, the wage statements Defendants provided to Class Members do not comply
24 with Labor Code § 226(a)(8). Moreover, the wage statements given to Class Members contain
25 unlawful deductions by Defendants. Further, the wage statements given to Class Members failed to
26 accurately account for unpaid wages and overtime because Defendants under-reported Class
27 Members' actual hours worked due to the off the clock work. Additionally, the wage statements
28 given to Class Members failed to accurately account for premium pay for deficiently provided meal

1 periods and rest breaks. Thus, the wage statements do not provide accurate hourly rates for overtime
2 and the statements do not comply with Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

3 82. Throughout the liability period, Defendants intentionally failed to furnish to Class
4 Members, upon each payment of wages, itemized statements accurately showing: (1) gross wages
5 earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any
6 applicable piece rate paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the
7 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only
8 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other
9 than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and
10 (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
11 worked at each hourly rate by the employee pursuant to Labor Code § 226, amongst other statutory
12 requirements. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Class Members with such
13 timely and accurate wage and hour statements.

14 83. Class Members suffered injury as a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional
15 failure to provide them with the accurate wage and hour statements as required by law and are
16 presumed to have suffered injury and be entitled to penalties under Labor Code § 226(e), as the
17 Defendants have failed to provide wage statements with accurate and complete information as
18 required by any one or more of items Labor Code § 226 (a)(1) to (9), inclusive, and Class Members
19 cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone one or more of the following:
20 (i) The amount of the gross wages or net wages paid to the employee during the pay period or any
21 of the other information required to be provided on the itemized wage statement pursuant to items
22 (2) to (4), inclusive, (6), and (9) of subdivision (a), (ii) Which deductions the employer made from
23 gross wages to determine the net wages paid to the employee during the pay period, (iii) The name
24 and address of the employer and, (iv) The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his
25 or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security
26 number. For purposes of Labor Code § 226(e) "promptly and easily determine" means a reasonable
27 person [i.e. an objective standard] would be able to readily ascertain the information without
28 reference to other documents or information.

1 84. Therefore, as a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code §
2 226(a), Class Members suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they
3 received all wages owed to them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records,
4 and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact
5 compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

6 85. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and 1174, and the applicable IWC
7 Wage Order, paragraph 7(B), Class Members are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages
8 or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars
9 (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four
10 thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

11 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 203**

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 86. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
15 full herein.

16 87. Numerous Class Members are no longer employed by Defendants; they either quit
17 Defendants' employ or were fired therefrom.

18 88. Defendants failed to pay these Class Members all wages due and certain at the time
19 of termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation.

20 89. The wages withheld from these Class Members by Defendants remained due and
21 owing for more than thirty (30) days from the date of separation from employment.

22 90. Defendants failed to pay Class Members without abatement, all wages as defined by
23 applicable California law. Class Members were not paid all regular and overtime wages because
24 Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked and required off the clock work. Additionally,
25 Defendants failed to pay premium wages owed for unprovided meal periods and rest periods, as
26 further detailed in this Complaint. Defendants' failure to pay said wages within the required time
27 was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

28 91. Defendants' failure to pay wages, as alleged, entitles these Class Members to

1 penalties under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until
2 paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 204**

5 **(Against All Defendants)**

6 92. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
7 full herein.

8 93. Labor Code § 204 instructs that: "All wages, ...earned by any person in any
9 employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance
10 by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive,
11 of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during
12 which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive,
13 of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month."
14 Additionally, the requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for
15 weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days
16 following the close of the payroll period." As detailed above, Defendants maintained a consistently
17 applied policy and practice of not paying all wages earned between the 1st and 15th days of a month
18 between the 16th and 26th day and failed to pay all wages earned between the 16th and the last day
19 of the month between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Defendants similarly failed to pay
20 all wages earned by not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.
21 These failures all arose from Defendants' failure to pay for all hours worked, as detailed above.

22 94. All wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Class Members, including as required
23 under Labor Code § 510, were therefore not timely paid by Defendants, as addressed in detail above.
24 Additionally, wages required by Labor Code § 1194 and other sections became due and payable to
25 each Class Member in each pay period that he or she was not provided with a meal period or rest
26 period or paid straight or overtime wages or commissions to which he or she was entitled.

27 95. Defendants thus violated Labor Code § 204 by systematically refusing to pay wages
28 due under the Labor Code, as addressed above. Additionally, under paragraph 4(B) of the applicable

1 IWC Wage Orders, employers are required “to pay each employee, on the established payday for
2 the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll
3 period, ...” Under Labor Code § 1198, “[t]he employment of any employee for longer hours than
4 those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.” Plaintiff
5 and the Class Members may therefore pursue damages and penalties for violations of Labor Code §
6 204 and paragraph 4(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, including penalties under paragraph
7 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

8 96. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and Class Members seek to
9 represent they have been deprived of wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and they are entitled
10 to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys’ fees, and costs, pursuant
11 to Labor Code § 210, 218.5, 1194 and 1198, and paragraphs 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC
12 Wage Orders.

13 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO KEEP REQUIRED PAYROLL RECORDS UNDER LABOR CODE § 1174**

15 **AND 1174.5**

16 **(Against All Defendants)**

17 97. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
18 full herein.

19 98. California Labor Code § 1174 requires that all employers shall keep accurate time
20 and wage records for all employees. California Labor Code § 1174.5 further requires that any
21 employee suffering injury due to a willful violation of the aforementioned obligations may seek
22 damages, including civil penalties, from the employer.

23 99. During the course of Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ employment, Defendants
24 consistently failed to maintain accurate time and wage records for Plaintiff and Class Members as
25 required by California Labor Code § 1174 by failing to pay Plaintiff and Class Members proper
26 wages, overtime, and premium pay as discussed above.

27 100. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for civil penalties pursuant to the California
28 Labor Code § 1174.5 for the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 221**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 101. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
5 full herein.

6 102. Labor Code § 221 provides, “It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or
7 receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee.”

8 103. Defendants unlawfully received and/or collected wages from employees. Defendants
9 unlawfully removed wages for overpayment that Employees never agreed to in violation of Labor
10 Code § 221.

11 104. As a direct and proximate cause of the unauthorized deductions, Employees have
12 been damaged, in an amount to be determined at trial.

13 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 ET SEQ.**

15 **(Against All Defendants)**

16 105. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
17 full herein.

18 106. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, Class Members, and the general public, brings this
19 claim pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* The conduct of Defendants as
20 alleged in this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Class
21 Members and the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public
22 interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

23 107. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code
24 § 17204, has suffered an injury, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for
25 injunctive relief, restitution, and other appropriate equitable relief.

26 108. Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* prohibits unlawful and unfair
27 business practices. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants’ practices were deceptive and
28 fraudulent in that Defendants’ policy and practice failed to provide the required amount of

1 compensation for missed meal and rest breaks, and failed to adequately compensate Class
2 Members for all hours worked, due to systematic business practices as alleged herein that cannot
3 be justified, pursuant to the applicable California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission
4 requirements in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for
5 which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to California Business &
6 Professions Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

7 109. Wage-and-hour laws express fundamental public policies. Paying employees their
8 wages and overtime, providing them with meal periods and rest breaks, etc., are fundamental
9 public policies of California. Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of this State
10 vigorously to enforce minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or
11 permitted to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding
12 employers and their employees from competitors who lower costs to themselves by failing to
13 comply with minimum labor standards.

14 110. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct alleged
15 in this Complaint Defendants have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated specific
16 provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business practices in
17 violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; which conduct has deprived Plaintiff,
18 and all persons similarly situated, and all interested persons, of the rights, benefits, and privileges
19 guaranteed to all employees under the law.

20 111. Defendants' conduct, as alleged above, constitutes unfair competition in violation
21 of the Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

22 112. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, by failing to pay wages and
23 overtime, failing to provide meal periods and rest breaks, etc., either knew or in the exercise of
24 reasonable care should have known that their conduct was unlawful; therefore their conduct
25 violates the Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

26 113. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in
27 a business practice which violates California and federal law, including but not limited to, the
28 applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor

1 Code including Sections 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1198, for which this Court
2 should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to California Business & Professions
3 Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair
4 competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

5 114. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Class Members
6 have been damaged, in a sum to be proven at trial.

7 115. Unless restrained by this Court Defendants will continue to engage in such
8 unlawful conduct as alleged above. Pursuant to the Business & Professions Code, this Court
9 should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be
10 necessary to prevent the use by Defendants or their agents or employees of any unlawful or
11 deceptive practice prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, including but not limited to the
12 disgorgement of such profits as may be necessary to restore Class Members to the money
13 Defendants have unlawfully failed to pay.

14 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 16 1. For an order certifying this action as a class action;
- 17 2. For compensatory damages in the amount of the unpaid minimum wages for work
18 performed by Class Members and unpaid overtime compensation from at least four (4) years prior
19 to the filing of this action, as may be proven;
- 20 3. For liquidated damages in the amount equal to the unpaid minimum wage and
21 interest thereon, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, according to proof;
- 22 4. For compensatory damages in the amount of all unpaid wages, including overtime
23 and double-time pay, as may be proven;
- 24 5. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Class
25 Members for each missed or deficient meal period where no premium pay was paid therefor from
26 four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, as may be proven;
- 27 6. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Class
28 Members for each day requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided where

no premium pay was paid therefor from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, as may be proven;

7. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) for Class Members, as may be proven;

8. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for all Class Members who quit or were fired in an amount equal to their daily wage times thirty (30) days, as may be proven;

9. For restitution and/or damages for all amounts unlawfully withheld from the wages for all class members in violation of Labor Code § 204, as may be proven;

10. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5, as may be proven;

11. For restitution and/or damages for all amounts unlawfully withheld from the wages for all class members in violation of Labor Code § 221, as may be proven;

12. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, including disgorgement or profits, as may be proven;

13. For an order enjoining Defendants and their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from acting in derogation of any rights or duties adumbrated in this Complaint;

14. For other wages and penalties under the Labor Code as may be proven;

15. For all general, special, and incidental damages as may be proven;

16. For an award of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;


17. For an award providing for the payment of the costs of this suit;

18. For an award of attorneys' fees; and

19. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper and just.

DATED: February 12, 2025

D.LAW, INC.


By: 
Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
Natalie Haritonian
Andrea A. Amaya Silva
Attorneys for Plaintiff APRIL DELGADO,
and all others similarly situated

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of her claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

DATED: February 12, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

By: 
Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
Natalie Haritounian
Andrea A. Amaya Silva
Attorneys for Plaintiff APRIL DELGADO,
and all others similarly situated