

Elliot J. Siegel (Bar No. 286798)
elliott@kingsiegel.com
Julian Burns King (Bar No. 298617)
julian@kingsiegel.com
KING & SIEGEL LLP
724 South Spring Street, Suite 201
Los Angeles, California 90014
tel: (213) 465-4802
fax: (213) 465-4803

Navid Barahmand (Bar No. 340934)
navid@barahmandlaw.com
BARAHMAND LAW GROUP
7324 Sepulveda Boulevard, Suite B
Van Nuys, CA 91405
tel: (818) 574-3355
fax: (818) 573-3757

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Putative Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN

Daniel Alvarado, individually and on
behalf of all similarly situated individuals,
Timoteo Prado Calderon, individually
and on behalf of all similarly situated
individuals;

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CTOS, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability
Company; and **Does 1-10**, inclusive;

Defendants.

CASE NO. ^{BCV-25-100908}

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;**
- 2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;**
- 3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;**
- 4) Failure to Provide Rest Periods;**
- 5) Failure to Provide and Maintain Complete and Accurate Wage Statements;**
- 6) Failure to Provide Wages When Due;**
- 7) Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses; and**
- 8) Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.**

1 Plaintiffs hereby bring this action on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated
2 current and former employees, by and through their counsel of record, alleges as follows:

3 **PARTIES**

4 1. At all relevant times for this Complaint, Plaintiff **Daniel Alvarado**, (“Mr.
5 Alvarado”) is and has been a resident of Kern County, California. Plaintiff was employed as an
6 hourly, non-exempt employee of Defendants from on or around February 18, 2018 to on or
7 around February 14, 2025. Plaintiff was subject to the policies and practices described in this
8 complaint at all times during his employment at Defendants.

9 2. At all relevant times for this Complaint, Plaintiff **Timoteo Prado Calderon**,
10 (“Mr. Calderon” and collectively with Mr. Alvarado as “Plaintiffs”) is and has been a resident of
11 Kern County, California. Plaintiff began his employment as an hourly, non-exempt employee of
12 Defendants beginning on or around March 2023 where he is currently employed. Mr. Calderon
13 was and is subject to the policies and practices described in this complaint at all times during his
14 employment at Defendants.

15 3. Defendant **CTOS, LLC** (“CTOS”) is a company that offers sales, rental, and service
16 of commercial trucks and equipment across California. On information and belief, employs at
17 least 100 hourly, non-exempt employees. Upon information and belief, CTOS operates a facility
18 in Kern County, California.

19 4. Plaintiffs are not currently aware of the names and true identities of defendants
20 Does 1-10 (collectively with CTOS as “Defendants”). Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend this
21 complaint to allege their true names and capacities when this information is available. Each Doe
22 defendant is responsible for the damages alleged pursuant to each of the causes of action
23 asserted, either through its own conduct, or vicariously through the conduct of others. All further
24 references in this complaint to any of the named Defendants includes the fictitiously named
25 defendants.

26 5. At all times alleged herein, each Defendant was an agent, servant, joint employer,
27 employee, partner, and/or joint venture of every other Defendant and was acting within the
28 scope of the Defendants’ relationship. Moreover, the conduct of every Defendant was ratified by

each other Defendant.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

6. The court has jurisdiction over all causes of action in this complaint pursuant to Article VI, § 10 of the California Constitution. No federal question is at issue; Plaintiffs rely solely on California statutes and law, including the Labor Code and the Business & Professions Code. Because putative class members were employed by Defendants, the policies and practices complained of herein were implemented in Kern County, and Defendants transact business within Kern County, Defendant is within the jurisdiction of the court for service of process. Moreover, Business & Professions Code § 17204 provides that any person acting on their own behalf may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction.

7. Venue as to Defendant is proper in this Superior Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395. Defendants transact business and/or have offices in this county, employ putative class members in this County, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

8. As a matter of uniform and systemic policy, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit non-exempt employees to take bona fide meal and rest breaks pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7.

9. Defendants have consistently denied their non-exempt employees the opportunities to take compliant 30-minute meal periods in accordance with California's Labor Code. Upon information and belief, Class Members, including Plaintiffs, were required to interrupt their meal periods to service customers, otherwise interrupt or cut short their meal periods, or remain on duty and under Defendants' control during their meal periods to perform other tasks at Defendants' directions due to Defendants' policies and practices.

10. In the same manner, and as a matter of uniform and systemic policy, Defendant requires non-exempt employees to continue working during their rest periods or otherwise interrupting or cut short their rest periods, or remain on duty and under Defendants' control during their rest periods to perform other tasks at Defendants' directions due to Defendants'

1 policies and practices. Accordingly, Defendants failed to authorize and permit compliant rest
2 periods as required by law.

3 11. In failing to authorize and/or permit meal and rest periods, Defendants have also
4 implemented a uniform policy of denying compensation in lieu of meal and rest periods to its
5 non-exempt employees, notwithstanding its actual knowledge that such employees were
6 uniformly denied compliant meal and rest periods.

7 12. As a matter of uniform and systemic policy, Defendants required non-exempt
8 employees to utilize their personal cell phones for work-related purposes, including making
9 outbound calls, answering texts and calls from their supervisors while at work or on a break,
10 being assigned tasks, and general administrative matters. Defendants further failed to
11 compensate their non-exempt employees for reasonable costs associated with utilizing their
12 personal cell phones for work-related purposes.

13 13. Plaintiffs therefore bring this action on behalf of themselves and as a class action
14 on behalf of the following defined Class:

15 **Non-Exempt Employee Class:**

16 *All persons who worked at least one shift as a non-exempt employee in the State*
17 *of California from the period four years prior to the filing of the Action and the*
date of trial ("Class").

18 14. Common methods of proof exist for determining these issues on a class-wide basis,
19 including but not limited to, Defendants' employment records, payroll records, timesheets,
20 policies, and disciplinary records.

21 15. **Numerosity.** Plaintiffs are informed and believe that, during the class period, at
22 least 100 Class Members have been employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants within
23 the state of California. The number of Class Members is sufficiently numerous such that joinder
24 of all members is impossible or impracticable.

25 16. **Typicality.** Plaintiffs' claims are typical of all Class Members. Plaintiffs, like all
26 other Class Members, was subjected to the policies and practices set forth above. Plaintiffs' job
27 duties were typical of Class Members in all relevant respects.

28 17. **Adequacy.** There are no material conflicts between the claims of the

representative Plaintiffs and Class Members that would make class certification inappropriate. Plaintiffs understand their obligations to inform the Court of any relationship, conflicts, or differences with any Class Member. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class Members. Plaintiffs are invested in redressing Defendants' illegal practices on behalf of all Class Members. Moreover, Plaintiffs have retained competent counsel experienced in both class action and employment litigation. Plaintiffs' attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement, and will vigorously assert the claims of all Class Members. Plaintiffs have incurred, and will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each Class Member.

18. **Existence and Predominance of Common Issues.** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all Class Members and predominate over issues affecting individual Class Members, including, but not limited to:

- a. Whether Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of depriving Plaintiffs and Class Members of required minimum wages;
- b. Whether Defendants unlawfully and/or willfully failed to compensate Plaintiffs and Class Members required minimum wages;
- c. Whether Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of depriving Plaintiffs and Class Members of required overtime wages;
- d. Whether Defendants unlawfully and/or willfully failed to compensate Plaintiffs and Class Members required overtime wages;
- e. Whether Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of depriving Plaintiffs and Class Members of compliant, off-duty meal and/or rest periods;
- f. Whether Defendants unlawfully and/or willfully deprived Plaintiffs and Class Members of compliant, off-duty meal and/or rest periods;
- g. Whether Defendants have a common policy and/or practice of failing to maintain accurate payroll records in the State of California;

- 1 h. Whether Defendants unlawfully and/or willfully failed to maintain accurate
2 payroll records in the State of California;
- 3 i. Whether Defendants have a common policy and/or practice of failing to
4 provide accurate wage statements reflecting hours worked and wages
5 earned to Plaintiffs and Class Members;
- 6 j. Whether Defendants unlawfully and/or willfully failed to provide accurate
7 wage statements reflecting hours worked and wages earned to Plaintiffs and
8 Class Members;
- 9 k. Whether Defendants have a common policy and/or practice of failing to
10 reimburse Plaintiffs and Class Members for reasonable business expenses;
- 11 l. Whether Defendants unlawfully and/or willfully failed to reimburse
12 Plaintiffs and Class Members for reasonable business expenses;
- 13 m. Whether Defendants has a policy and/or practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs
14 and Class Members final wages owed upon termination;
- 15 n. Whether Defendants unlawfully and/or willfully failed to promptly pay
16 compensation due to Plaintiffs and Class Members upon termination of
17 employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203;
- 18 o. Whether Plaintiffs and Class Members sustained damages as a result of any
19 of the aforementioned violations, and, if so, the proper measure of those
20 damages, including interest, penalties, costs, attorneys' fees, and equitable
21 relief; and
- 22 p. Whether Defendants violated the Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof.
23 Code § 17200, et seq., by violating the above provisions of law.

24 19. **Superiority.** A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and
25 efficient adjudication of this dispute. The damages suffered by individual Class Members, while
26 substantial, are small compared to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the
27 complex and expensive litigation necessary to address Defendants' conduct. Even if Class
28 Members themselves could afford individual litigation, the court system would be overwhelmed

1 by individual lawsuits if all Class Members sought redress. In addition, individualized litigation
2 increases the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from the complex
3 legal and factual issues of this case. Individualized litigation also presents a potential for
4 inconsistent or contradictory judgments. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer
5 management difficulties; it allows the hearing of claims which might otherwise go unaddressed
6 because of the relative expense of bringing individual lawsuits, and it provides the benefits of
7 single adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.
8 Plaintiffs contemplate providing individual notice to members of the class defined above as
9 identified through Defendants' records.

10 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 ***California Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198***

13 ***Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked***

14 **(Plaintiffs and Class Against Defendants)**

15 20. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference all allegations contained in the
16 preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

17 21. California law requires employers to compensate employees for all time that an
18 employee is "suffered or permitted to work," which includes all time "when any employer
19 'directs, commands or restrains' an employee." *See, e.g., Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.*, 22 Cal.
20 4th 575, 583 (2000), as modified (May 10, 2000); *see also* Code Regs. tit. 8, § 11070 ("Hours
21 worked' means the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and
22 includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to
23 do so.").

24 22. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the Class for all hours worked
25 because Defendants had a policy and/or practice whereby they required and/or pressured Class
26 Members to work under Defendants' control while off-the-clock, including but not limited to
27 forcing or requiring Class Members to work while they were clocked out for their meal periods.

28 23. Upon information and belief, Defendants required Class Members to work off the

1 clock or failed to pay all earned wages in ways unknown to Plaintiffs at this time.

2 24. Defendants further failed to pay Plaintiffs and Class Members any wages for time
3 engaged in this off-the-clock work.

4 25. As a result of Defendants' failure and refusal to comply with California law,
5 Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to recover actual and liquidated damages for the
6 unpaid time, plus injunctive relief and reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Lab. Code §§ 1194,
7 1197.1.

8 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 ***California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198***

10 ***Unpaid Overtime***

11 **(Plaintiffs and Class Against Defendants)**

12 26. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference every allegation in this complaint as if fully set
13 forth herein.

14 27. California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 provide that it is unlawful to employ
15 persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that
16 person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily
17 or weekly basis.

18 28. Plaintiffs and Class Members who work more than eight hours in a day or more
19 than forty hours in a workweek are to be paid at the rate of time and one-half (1½) for all hours
20 worked in excess of eight hours in a day or more than forty hours in a workweek. An employee's
21 regular rate of pay includes all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf of, the
22 employee, including commissions, non-discretionary bonuses and incentive pay. *Alvarado v.*
23 *Dart Container Corp. of California*, 4 Cal. 5th 542, 573 (2018), as modified (Apr. 25, 2018).

24 29. Throughout the Class Period, Plaintiffs and other Class Members were not paid
25 overtime premiums for all of the hours they worked in excess of eight hours in a day, in excess
26 of twelve hours in a day, in excess of eight hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a
27 workweek, and in excess of forty hours in a week based on the off the clock work described above.

28 30. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and Class Members did not

1 receive overtime compensation. Because Plaintiffs and Class Members sometimes worked shifts
2 of more than eight hours a day or forty hours a week, they should have been adequately
3 compensated at their appropriate overtime rate of pay. Accordingly, Defendants' failure to pay
4 overtime compensation resulted in Plaintiffs and Class Members being deprived of earned
5 overtime wages.

6 31. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to recover
7 their unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

8 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 ***California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512(a), and 1198***

10 ***Meal Period Violations***

11 **(Plaintiffs and Class Against Defendants)**

12 32. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference every allegation in this complaint as if fully set
13 forth herein.

14 33. At all times relevant to this complaint, Defendants knew they were obligated to
15 provide legally-compliant meal breaks to its non-exempt employees pursuant to Labor Code
16 §§ 512 and 226.7. Labor Code § 512(a) states in pertinent part: "[A]n employer may not employ
17 an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee
18 with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes. An employer may not employ an employee for a
19 work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal
20 period of not less than 30 minutes."

21 34. Labor Code section 226.7, 512(a), and 1198 provide that no employer shall require
22 an employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable order of the IWC. "An
23 off-duty meal period, therefore, is one in which the employee is relieved of all duty during the
24 30-minute meal period . . . an employer's obligation is to provide an off-duty meal period: an
25 uninterrupted 30-minute period during which the employee is relieved of all duty." *Brinker*
26 *Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1035 (2012).

27 35. Defendants' policies and practices served to deprive the Class of a full 30-minute
28 break period free of employer control or relieved of all duties. Upon information and belief,

employees were required to skip meal periods, interrupt their meal periods, take meal periods after the fifth hour of work, or remain under Defendants control while on meal periods .

36. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and Class Members were uniformly denied meal periods as a result of Defendants' formal policies and practices. By failing to consistently provide uninterrupted, off-duty 30-minute meal periods, Defendants violated the Labor Code as to Plaintiffs and Class Members.

37. In failing to authorize and/or permit meal periods, Defendants have also implemented a uniform policy of denying compensation in lieu of meal periods to its non-exempt employees, notwithstanding its actual knowledge that such employees were uniformly denied compliant meal periods.

38. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants an additional hour of pay at their regular rates of pay for each shift in which a required meal period was not provided.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 1198

Failure to Provide Rest Periods or Premium Pay in Lieu Thereof

(Plaintiffs and Class Against Defendants)

39. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference every allegation in this complaint as if fully set forth herein.

40. At all times relevant to this complaint, Defendants knew they were obligated to provide compliant rest breaks to its non-exempt employees pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7.

41. Labor Code § 226.7 provides:

(a) No employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

(b) If any employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

1 42. Labor Code § 226.7, 512(a), and 1198 provide that no employer shall require an
2 employee to work during any rest or meal period mandated by an applicable order of the IWC,
3 including Wage Order No. 1. Employers must authorize and permit employees to be relieved of
4 all duty during their rest and meal periods: “A rest period, in short, must be a period of rest.”
5 *Augustus v. ABM Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 385 P.3d 823, 834 (2016).

6 43. Employees must also be free to leave the employer’s premises during their rest
7 period. *See id.* at 270 (“In the context of a 10-minute break that employers must provide during
8 the work period, a broad and intrusive degree of control exists when an employer requires
9 employees to remain on call and respond during breaks. An employee on call cannot take a brief
10 walk—five minutes out, five minutes back—if at the farthest extent of the walk he or she is not in
11 a position to respond. Employees similarly cannot use their 10 minutes to take care of other
12 personal matters that require truly uninterrupted time.”); *see also* Department of Industrial
13 Relations, “Rest Periods,” available at https://www.dir.ca.gov/dlse/FAQ_RestPeriods.htm
14 (“Q. Can my employer require that I stay on the work premises during my rest period? A. No,
15 your employer cannot impose any restraints not inherent in the rest period requirement itself.”).

16 44. Defendants failed to authorize or permit all required compliant paid rest periods
17 for shifts between 3.5 and ten hours, or subjected employees to interrupted, shortened, or on-
18 duty rest periods.

19 45. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ willful and unlawful conduct,
20 Plaintiffs and Class Members have sustained damages, including lost compensation resulting
21 from missed or non-compliant rest periods, in an amount to be established at trial.

22 46. In failing to authorize and/or permit rest periods, Defendants have also
23 implemented a uniform policy of denying compensation in lieu of rest periods to its non-exempt
24 employees, notwithstanding its actual knowledge that such employees were uniformly denied
25 compliant rest periods.

26 47. Pursuant to Wage Order No. 4 and Labor Code § 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and Class
27 Members are entitled to recover from Defendants an additional hour of pay at their regular rates
28 of pay for each shift that a compliant rest period was not provided. Defendants were aware that

1 their actions were a violation of applicable law but consistently refused to pay premium pay as
2 required by law.

3 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 ***Labor Code §§ 226. 226.3, and 1174***

5 ***Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements***

6 **(Plaintiffs and Class Against Defendants)**

7 48. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference all allegations contained in the
8 preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

9 49. Labor Code § 226 requires employers to furnish employees with an accurate,
10 itemized statement in writing showing, among other things, (1) gross wages earned; (2) total
11 hours worked by the employee (for hourly-paid, non-exempt employees); (3) all deductions; (4)
12 net wages earned; (5) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (6) the
13 name of the employee and the last four digits of his or his social security number; (7) the name
14 and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (8) all applicable hourly rates in effect
15 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
16 employee.

17 50. At all times relevant to this complaint, Defendants' failure to pay premium wages
18 for missed meal and/or rest periods further ensured that Class Members' wage statements
19 inaccurately reflected gross and net wages earned. Defendants' failure to compensate all hours
20 worked and/or pay all required overtime rates further left the wage statements they provided to
21 employees to be inaccurate.

22 51. Defendants have also failed to keep accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs and Class
23 Members in accordance with Labor Code § 1174. Defendants' failure to keep and maintain
24 accurate payroll records reflecting hours worked and wages earned has impeded Plaintiffs and
25 Class Members' ability to calculate unpaid wages earned.

26 52. Injury. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code
27 § 226, causing injury and damages to Plaintiffs and Class Members. Plaintiffs and all those
28 similarly situated were injured by these failures because, among other things, they were confused

1 about whether they were paid properly and/or they were misinformed about how much
2 compensation was owed. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs incurred
3 calculating the correct net wages for each pay period and the amount of employment taxes that
4 were not paid to state and federal tax authorities.

5 53. Relief. Labor Code § 226(e)(1) provides that an employee suffering injury as a
6 result of not being provided with an accurate itemized wage statement is entitled to recover the
7 greater of all actual damages suffered or fifty (\$50) dollars for the initial violation and one
8 hundred (\$100) dollars for each subsequent violation, up to \$4,000. Pursuant to Labor Code §§
9 226(e) and (g), Plaintiff and all others similarly situated are entitled to injunctive relief to ensure
10 Defendant's compliance with Labor Code § 226, as well as attorney's fees and costs of suit.

11 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 ***Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, and 204***

13 ***Failure to Pay Wages When Due***

14 **(Plaintiffs and Class Against Defendants)**

15 54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegation contained in the preceding
16 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

17 55. Labor Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that:

18
19 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his
20 or his employment, his or her wages¹ shall become due and payable not
21 later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours
22 previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee
23 is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. Notwithstanding any
other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-hour
notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests
and designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute
the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment
within 72 hours of quitting.

24 56. Defendants do not include definite periods of service in their contracts of
25
26

27 ¹ Labor Code § 200 defines "wages" as "all amounts for labor performed by employees of every
28 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task, piece,
commission basis, or other method of calculation." "Labor" is defined as "labor, work, or service
... if the labor to be paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment."

1 employment for Class Members employed at their California facility. Plaintiffs' contract of
2 employment did not include a definite term.

3 57. Labor Code § 203 provides:

4 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in
5 accordance with § 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee
6 who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue
7 as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until
an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for
more than 30 days.

8 58. Labor Code § 204 provides that all wages, other than those mentioned in Section
9 201 and 202, are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in
10 advance by the employer as regular paydays.

11 59. Failure to Timely Pay Wages Due. As set forth above, Defendants failed to timely
12 pay the overtime wages and meal and rest period premiums resulting from its deficient
13 timekeeping and meal and rest period policies.

14 60. Failure to Pay Upon Termination. Plaintiffs and many Class Members have left
15 Defendants' employ during the Class Period. As discussed above, Defendants knowingly failed
16 to pay Plaintiffs and Class Members all earned wages upon termination. Instead, Defendants
17 willfully and intentionally refused to pay the earned rest and/or meal period premiums and
18 earned minimum wages as alleged herein to Plaintiffs and Class Members in violation of Labor
19 Code §§ 201 and 202.

20 61. Relief. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and those Class Members who are no
21 longer employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or
22 within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employment, violates Labor Code
23 §§ 201 and 202. Plaintiffs and formerly employed Class Members are therefore entitled to
24 recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, at their
25 regular rate of pay, up to a 30-day maximum penalty under Labor Code § 203.

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 ***California Labor Code § 2802***

3 ***Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses***

4 **(Plaintiffs and Class Against Defendants)**

5 62. Plaintiffs repeat, replead, and incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth in
6 this paragraph, all the allegations of this Complaint.

7 63. Labor Code section 2802 provides that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her
8 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
9 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
10 the employer.” Lab. Code § 2802. The purpose of Labor Code section 2802 is to prevent
11 employers from passing off their cost of doing business and operating expenses on to their
12 employees. *Cochran v. Schwan’s Home Service, Inc.*, 228 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1144 (2014).

13 64. Defendants required non-exempt employees to utilize their personal cell phones
14 for work-related purposes, making outbound calls, including answering texts and calls from their
15 supervisors while at work or on a break, being assigned tasks, and general administrative
16 matters. Defendants further failed to compensate their non-exempt employees for reasonable
17 costs associated with utilizing their personal cell phones for work-related purposes.

18 65. Defendants failed to reimburse a reasonable portion of the Class Members’
19 cellphone related expenses despite requiring the use of the device and/or applications that
20 required a data plan. *See Cochran v. Schwan’s Home Serv., Inc.*, 228 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1144
21 (“We hold that when employees must use their personal cell phones for work related calls, Labor
22 Code section 2802 requires the employer to reimburse them. Whether the employees have cell
23 phone plans with unlimited minutes or limited minutes, the reimbursement owed is a reasonable
24 percentage of their cell phone bills.”). Defendant further failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the
25 Class Members for the purchase of work-related equipment.

26 66. By unlawfully failing to pay Plaintiffs and Class Members, Defendants are liable for
27 a reasonable portion of the incurred expenses, to be determined upon trial, plus reasonable
28 attorneys’ fees and costs. Lab. Code § 2802.

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 ***California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.***

3 ***Unlawful Business Practices***

4 **(Plaintiffs and Class Against Defendants)**

5 67. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference every allegation in this complaint as
6 if fully set forth herein.

7 68. Defendant CTOS is a “person(s)” as defined by California Business & Professions
8 Code § 17201, as they are a natural person, corporations, firms, partnerships, joint stock
9 companies, and/or associations.

10 69. Unlawful Business Practices. Defendants’ knowing violations of the Labor Code
11 constitutes an unlawful business practice as set forth in Business & Professions Code § 17200, et
12 seq.

13 70. Defendants’ failure to abide by the laws discussed herein provided Defendants an
14 unfair advantage over their competitors at the expense of their workers. Instead, Defendants
15 cuts corners in the name of higher profits and at the expense of employee well-being. Defendants’
16 actions thereby constitute an unfair, fraudulent, and/or unlawful business practice under
17 Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

18 71. Relief. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action seeking equitable and injunctive relief
19 to stop Defendant’s willful and ongoing misconduct, and to seek restitution of the amounts
20 Defendants acquired through the unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business practices described
21 herein. In addition, Plaintiffs seek an award of costs and attorneys’ fees pursuant to California
22 Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

23 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

24 Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 631, Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on
25 all issues so triable.
26
27
28

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully prays judgment as follows:

3 A. For an Order:

4 a. Certifying the Class;

5 b. Appointing Plaintiffs as representatives of the Class;

6 c. Appointing Plaintiffs' counsel as Class Counsel;

7 B. For actual and liquidated damages according to proof at trial;

8 C. For statutory and civil penalties and special damages, according to proof at trial;

9 D. For pre- and post-judgment interest on monetary damages;

10 E. For preliminary and permanent injunctive relief;

11 F. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs and expert fees and costs as allowed by
12 law; and

13 G. For such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.
14
15

16 Dated: March 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

17 **KING & SIEGEL LLP**
18

19 By: /s/ Elliot J. Siegel

20 Elliot J. Siegel, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
21

22 Dated: March 11, 2025

BARAHMAND LAW GROUP

23
24 By: /s/ Navid Barahmand

25 Navid Barahmand, Esq.

26 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
27
28