

1 **PIMENTEL LAW, P.C.**
2 Gabriel J. Pimentel, Esq. (SBN 265328)
3 GJP@PimentelLaw.com
4 Kelly M. Hatfield, Esq. (SBN 336377)
5 KMH@PimentelLaw.com
6 30 N. Raymond Avenue, Suite 210
7 Pasadena, CA 91103
8 Telephone: (626) 765-6505
9 Fax: (626) 628-3036
10
11 Attorney for Plaintiff,
12 JERIME SAUNDERS

10 **IN THE SUPERIOR OF CALIFORNIA**
11 **COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

12 JERIME SAUNDERS, an individual, on behalf of
13 all others similarly situated,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC., a California
17 corporation, CATHY LEMKE, an individual,
18 FRED LEMKE, an individual, and DOES 1
19 through 20 inclusive,

20 Defendants.

Case No. 34-2022-00331427

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wage in Violation of Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198;
2. Failure to Pay Overtime in Violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198;
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods in Violation of §§ 226.7, 512 (a), and 1198;
4. Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802;
5. Failure to Furnish Compliant Wage Statements and Maintain Accurate Pay Records in violation of § 226, 1174 (d), and 1198;
6. Failure to Timely Pay Wages in Violation of Labor Code § 204;
7. Willful Failure to Pay Wages in Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203;

8. Unfair Competition in Violation of Labor Code §§17200, et seq.;

9. Civil Penalties in Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.

Jury Trial Demanded

1. Plaintiff JERIME SAUNDERS, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, and as an aggrieved employee on behalf of all other aggrieved employees, is informed and believes and thereon alleges as follows:

PARTIES, VENUE AND JURISDICTION

2. This Class Action is brought pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382 to recover wages and all other available relief on behalf of Plaintiff and all similarly situated current and former non-exempt, hourly- paid employees of Defendants.

3. This enforcement action is brought pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq. (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties and any other available relief on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants and against whom one or more Labor Code violations or any provision regulating hours and days of work in the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order were committed, as set forth in this Complaint.

4. Plaintiff JERIME SAUNDERS worked as a Pre-Delivery Technician for PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC., CATHY LEMKE, FRED LEMKE, and DOES 1-20, a recreational vehicle dealer, at 1199 El Camino Ave., Sacramento, CA 95815, from January 3, 2022 to August 11, 2022. Plaintiff's job duties included performing pre-delivery inspections on new and used RVs before clients took possession.

5. Plaintiff JERIME SAUNDERS was at all times relevant hereto a resident of Folsom, California.

6. At all relevant times herein, Defendant PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC. was a Corporation with its principal place of business in Sacramento, California.

1 7. Defendant CATHY LEMKE was at all times relevant herein the principal of
2 PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC..

3 8. Defendant FRED LEMKE was at all times relevant herein the principal of
4 PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC..

5 9. Venue is proper pursuant to California Civil Procedure Code §§ 395 (a) and 395.5
6 because this suit was filed in the county where the liability arises, where the breach occurred and
7 where Defendants resided at the commencement of this action.

8 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that there exists such a
9 unity of interest and ownership between PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC., CATHY LEMKE,
10 FRED LEMKE, and DOES 1-20 that the individuality and separateness of defendants have ceased to
11 exist.

12 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that despite the formation
13 of purported corporate existence, PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC., CATHY LEMKE, FRED
14 LEMKE and DOES 1-20 are, in reality, one and the same.

15 12. PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC., CATHY LEMKE, FRED LEMKE, and DOES 1-
16 20 do not comply with all requisite corporate formalities to maintain a legal and separate existence.

17 13. The business affairs of PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC., CATHY LEMKE, FRED
18 LEMKE and DOES 1-20 are, and at all times relevant were, so mixed and intermingled that the same
19 cannot reasonably be segregated, and the same are in inextricable confusion. PROGRESSIVE
20 HOUSING, INC. is, and at all times relevant hereto was, used by DOES 1-20, CATHY LEMKE and
21 FRED LEMKE as a mere shell and conduit for the conduct of certain of Defendants' affairs, and is,
22 and was, the alter ego of DOES 1-20. The recognition of the separate existence of PROGRESSIVE
23 HOUSING, INC. would not promote justice, in that it would permit Defendants to insulate themselves
24 from liability to Plaintiff for violations of state law. The corporate existence of PROGRESSIVE
25 HOUSING, INC. and DOES 1-20 should be disregarded in equity and for the ends of justice because
26 such disregard is necessary to avoid fraud and injustice to Plaintiff herein.

27 14. Accordingly, PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC., CATHY LEMKE, FRED LEMKE
28 and DOES 1-20 are the alter egos of one another, and the fiction of their separate corporate existence

1 must be disregarded.

2 15. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
3 thereon alleges that PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC., CATHY LEMKE, FRED LEMKE and
4 DOES 1-20 are joint employers by virtue of a joint enterprise, and that the employees and agents of
5 PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC. were also employees of CATHY LEMKE, FRED LEMKE and
6 DOES 1-20. PROGRESSIVE HOUSING, INC. employees performed services for each and every
7 one of Defendants, and to the mutual benefit of all Defendants, and all Defendants shared control of
8 them as employees, either directly or indirectly, and the manner in which Defendants' business was
9 and is conducted.

10 16. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
11 of the Defendants named herein as DOES 1-20, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and
12 therefore these Defendants are sued by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this
13 Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they become known to
14 Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereupon alleges, that each of the fictitiously
15 named Defendants is responsible for the wrongful acts alleged herein and are therefore liable to
16 Plaintiff as alleged hereinafter.

17 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereupon alleges, that at all times relevant
18 hereto, Defendants were the agents, employees, managing agents, supervisors, coconspirators, parent
19 corporation, joint employers, alter egos, successors, and/or joint ventures of the other Defendants,
20 and each of them, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting at least in part within the course
21 and scope of said agency, employment, conspiracy, joint employer, alter ego status, successor status
22 and/or joint venture and with the permission and consent of each of the other Defendants.

23 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereupon alleges, that Defendants,
24 including those defendants named as DOES 1-20 acted in concert with one another to commit the
25 wrongful acts alleged herein, and aided, abetted, incited, compelled and/or coerced one another in the
26 wrongful acts alleged herein, and/or attempted to do so. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and
27 based thereupon alleges, that Defendants, including those defendants named as DOES 1-20 formed
28 and executed a conspiracy or common plan pursuant to which they would commit the unlawful acts

1 alleged herein, with all such acts alleged herein done as part of and pursuant to said conspiracy,
2 intended to cause and actually causing Plaintiff's harm.

3 19. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act or failure to
4 act by a Defendant or co-Defendant, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to mean
5 the acts and/or failures to act by each Defendant acting individually, jointly and severally.

6
7 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

8 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Plaintiff and class members
9 were not paid for all hours worked because all hours worked were not recorded.

10 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
11 have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime
12 compensation and that they were in fact not receiving certain wages for overtime compensation.

13 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
14 have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for
15 compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for work that was required
16 to be done off-the-clock. In violation of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff and class members were
17 not paid at least minimum wages for work done off-the-clock.

18 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
19 have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to meal periods in accordance with the
20 Labor Code or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rates of pay when they were
21 not provided with timely, uninterrupted, 30 minute meal periods and that Plaintiff and class members
22 were not provided with all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular
23 rates of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted, 30 minute meal period.

24 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
25 have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to timely payment of all wages earned
26 upon termination of employment. In violation of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff and class
27 members did not receive payment of all wages due, including overtime wages, minimum wages,
28 and meal and rest period premiums, within the time periods required by law.

25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should

1 have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
2 employment. Plaintiff and class members did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime
3 wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums in violation of the California Labor
4 Code.

5 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
6 have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive full reimbursement for all
7 business-related expenses and costs they incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their
8 duties and that they did not receive full reimbursement of applicable business-related expenses and
9 costs incurred.

10 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
11 mentioned, Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and
12 class members for all hours worked, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
13 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so.

14 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

15 28. Plaintiff's proposed Class consists of:
16 All persons who worked for Defendants as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees in California, within
17 four years prior to the filing of the initial complaint until the date of trial ("Class").

18 29. Plaintiff's proposed subclass consists of:
19 All persons who worked for Defendants as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees in California and who
20 received at least one wage statement within one year prior to the filing of the initial complaint until
21 the date of trial ("Subclass").

22 30. Members of the Class and Subclass are referred to herein as "Class."

23 31. Plaintiff reserves the right to redefine the Class and to add additional subclasses as
24 appropriate based on further investigation and discovery.

25 32. At all relevant times, Defendants have had a common and consistent policy and
26 practice of failing to pay the proper minimum wage and overtime, reimburse for necessary business
27 expenditures, furnish compliant wage statements, maintain accurate pay records, provide
28 uninterrupted meal and timely pay wages in violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

1 33. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the class members
2 are readily ascertainable:

3 34. **Numerosity:** The members of the Class are sufficiently numerous that joinder of all
4 members is impracticable. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time.
5 However, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the identity of such
6 membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

7 35. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the Class that are
8 answerable on a common basis, and these questions predominate over individual questions. The
9 questions of law and fact common to the Class include, without limitation:

- 10 a. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and class members to work over 8 hours
11 per day, over 12 hours per day, or over 40 hours per week and failed to pay them
12 all legally required overtime compensation;
- 13 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members at least minimum
14 wages for all hours worked;
- 15 c. Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and class members with meal
16 periods;
- 17 d. Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and class members with complete and
18 accurate wage statements as required by California Labor Code section 226 (a);
- 19 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay earned overtime wages, minimum wages, and
20 meal and rest period premiums due to Plaintiff and class members upon their
21 discharge;
- 22 f. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay overtime wages, minimum wages, and
23 meal and rest period premiums to Plaintiff and class members during their
24 employment;
- 25 g. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and class members for necessary
26 business expenditures, losses incurred by them in direct consequence of the
27 discharge of their duties or obedience to the directions of the employer;
- 28 h. Whether Defendants engaged in unlawful and unfair business practices in violation

1 of California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and,

- 2 i. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, or monetary penalties resulting
3 from Defendants' violations of California law.

4 36. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class he seeks to
5 represent. As set forth herein, Defendants' common course of conduct causes Plaintiff and similarly
6 situated persons employed by Defendants the same or similar injuries and damages. Plaintiff's claims
7 are thereby representative of and co-extensive with the claims of the Class.

8 37. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of all members
9 of the Class he seeks to represent. Plaintiff is members of the Class he seeks to represent, does not
10 have any conflicts of interest with the Class, will prosecute the case vigorously on behalf of the Class,
11 and has already devoted time and resources to the initial investigation of these claims. Plaintiff's
12 attorney is competent and experienced in litigating employment actions, including wage and hour
13 class actions.

14 38. **Superiority of Class Action:** A class action is superior to other available methods for
15 the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. In particular, Plaintiff is informed and believes
16 that some Class Members may be unwilling to bring individual lawsuits for fear of retaliation by
17 Defendants. Because the damages suffered by certain individual members of the Class may be
18 relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation make it impracticable for Class
19 Members to pursue their claims separately. Each member of the Class has been damaged and is
20 entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal, fraudulent and unfair employment practices and
21 policies. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in
22 the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system. Class action
23 treatment will also avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can be adjudicated in the
24 same manner for all members of the Class.

25 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGE IN VIOLATION OF**

27 **LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198**

28 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

1 39. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as
2 though fully set forth herein.

3 40. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
4 and 1198 provide that the minimum wage for employees fixed by the IWC is the minimum wage to
5 be paid to employees, and the payment of a wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.
6 Compensable work time is defined by the applicable wage order as “the time during which an
7 employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered
8 or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Cal. Code. Regs. tit. 8, § 11010 (2) (G).

9 41. Due to Defendants’ company-wide scheduling practices and policies, Plaintiff and
10 class members were forced to forego meal periods and/or have their meal periods interrupted by
11 work, and were not relieved of all duties for unpaid meal periods, in order to meet their deadlines
12 and handle their workloads. Defendants did not pay minimum wages for meal periods Plaintiff and
13 class members worked through that qualified for overtime premium payment. Defendants did not
14 pay Plaintiff and class members for the time they continued to perform their duties during their meal
15 periods. Plaintiff and class members were asked by Defendants to write on their timecards that they
16 took their meal periods, when instead they were actually working through them.

17 42. Defendants had no policy and/or practice for scheduling second meal periods for
18 employees or for authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and class members to take second 30-minute
19 meal periods on days they worked in excess of 10 hours in one day. As a result, Defendants did not
20 provide Plaintiff and class members with all second 30-minute meal periods to which they were
21 entitled.

22 43. Defendants did not pay at least minimum wages for all hours worked by Plaintiff and
23 class members. To the extent that these off-the-clock hours did not qualify for overtime premium
24 payment, Defendants did not pay at least minimum wages for those hours Plaintiff and class members
25 worked off-the-clock in violation of California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
26 and 1198. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and
27 class members for all of the hours they worked. Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and class
28 members minimum wages violates California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and

1 1198.

2 44. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and class members are
3 entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and
4 interest thereon.

5 45. Defendants failure to pay the legal minimum wage to Plaintiff and the Class as alleged
6 herein is unlawful and creates entitlement, pursuant to Labor Code §1194, to recovery by Plaintiff
7 and the Class in a civil action for the unpaid balance of the full amount of the unpaid wages owed,
8 including interest thereon.

9 46. Pursuant to Labor Code §1194, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of
10 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action.

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
12 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGE**
13 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 510 and 1198**
14 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

15 47. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as
16 though fully set forth herein.

17 48. Labor Code § 1198 makes it unlawful to employ an employee under conditions of
18 labor that are prohibited by the applicable wage order. California Labor Code § 1198 requires that
19 "the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the . . . standard conditions of
20 labor for employees. The employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by
21 the order is unlawful."

22 49. The applicable IWC Wage Order required Defendants to pay Plaintiff and class
23 members working more than 8 hours in a day or more than 40 hours in a workweek, at the rate of
24 time and one-half for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a workweek. The
25 applicable IWC Wage Order further required Defendants to pay Plaintiff and class members working
26 more than 12 hours in a day, overtime compensation at a rate of 2 times their regular rate of pay, and
27 2 times their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of 8 hours on the seventh consecutive
28 day of a work in a workweek.

1 50. At all relevant times, Defendants willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to
2 Plaintiff and class members. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and class members were not paid overtime
3 premiums for all of the hours they worked in excess of 8 hours in a day, in excess of 12 hours in a
4 day, and/or in excess of 40 hours in a week.

5 51. At all relevant times herein, Defendants had, and continue to have, a company-wide
6 policy of failing to implement any policies to authorize and permit employees to take compliant meal
7 periods and, instead, engaged in a practice of discouraging and impeding employees from taking
8 meal periods by assigning them a heavy workload and understaffing their facilities.

9 52. Additionally, Defendants, on a company-wide basis, failed to schedule meal periods
10 even though they are aware that employees are entitled to such meal periods. As a result of this
11 company-wide understaffing of its facilities and failure to schedule meal periods, Plaintiff and class
12 members were not always permitted and authorized to take uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods
13 during shifts to which they were entitled to receive a meal period. For example, Plaintiff regularly
14 worked through meal periods and had meal periods interrupted by supervisors and by work to meet
15 expected targets. Plaintiff and class members were asked by Defendants to write on their timecards
16 that they took their meal periods, when instead they were actually working through them.

17 53. At all relevant times, Defendants had no policy for scheduling second meal periods
18 and no practice of permitting Plaintiff and class members to take second 30-minute meal periods.
19 As a result, on days that Plaintiff and class members worked in excess of 10 hours, they were not
20 provided with second 30-minute meal periods.

21 54. Defendants knew or should have known that, as a result of their policies and practices,
22 Plaintiff and class members were performing some of their assigned duties off-the-clock and/or
23 during unpaid meal periods, and were suffered or permitted to perform work for which they were
24 not paid. Because Plaintiff and class members worked shifts in excess of 8 hours a day or more and
25 40 hours a week or more, much of this off-the-clock work qualified for overtime premium pay.
26 Therefore, Plaintiff and class members were not paid overtime wages for all of the overtime hours
27 they actually worked. To the extent Plaintiff and class members worked shifts in excess of 12 hours
28 a day, or in excess of 8 hours on the seventh consecutive day of a work in a workweek, Plaintiff and

1 class members were not paid double time wages for all overtime hours they actually worked.

2 55. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and class members the balance of overtime
3 compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of California Labor Code §§
4 510 and 1198. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and class members are entitled
5 to recover their unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

6 56. Labor Code §558 (a) requires that any person acting on behalf of an employer who
7 violates, or causes to be violated, overtime rules pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$50 for each
8 underpaid employee for each pay period in which the employee was underpaid in addition to an
9 amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. Also, Labor Code §558 (a) for each subsequent
10 violation, the person acting on behalf of an employer is liable in the amount of \$100 for each
11 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an
12 amount sufficient to recover the underpaid wages.

13 57. In addition to the above withheld overtime wages, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled
14 to civil penalties based upon Defendants' underpayment of overtime wages. Defendants violated
15 Labor Code §558 on each of the past pay periods within the one-year preceding the filing of this
16 complaint, the first of which Defendants are penalized \$50.00, and the remainder of which Defendants
17 are penalized \$100.00 each, for a total due in Labor Code §558 penalties in an amount to be proven
18 at trial.

19 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

21 **LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512 (a) and 1198**

22 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

23 58. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as
24 though fully set forth herein.

25 59. "An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours
26 per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if
27 the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be
28 waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee. An employer shall not employ an

1 employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a
2 second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than
3 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee
4 only if the first meal period was not waived.” Labor Code § 512; IWC Wage Order Nos. 1–2001 to
5 16–2001, § 11; IWC Wage Order No. 17-2001, § 9; 8 Cal Code Regs §§ 11010-11160, § 11; 8 Cal
6 Code Regs § 11170, § 9.

7 60. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 (a), 1198 and the applicable
8 IWC Wage Order also require employers to provide a second meal break of not less than 30 minutes
9 if an employee works over 10 hours per day or to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the
10 employee’s regular rate, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second
11 meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first
12 meal period was not waived.

13 61. “An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal ... period mandated
14 pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare
15 Commission If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal ... period in accordance with a
16 state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or
17 order of the Industrial Welfare Commission ... the employer shall pay the employee one additional
18 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal ... period
19 is not provided.” Lab. Code § 226.7 (b) & (c).

20 62. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Class regularly worked more than five hours per
21 day, and were thereby entitled to take uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods on each day of work.

22 63. At all relevant times herein, Defendants had, and continue to have, a company-wide
23 policy and/or practice of understaffing their locations while simultaneously assigning demanding
24 workloads, which had the combined effect of preventing Plaintiff and class members from taking all
25 timely, uninterrupted meal periods to which they were entitled. Additionally, Defendants had no
26 policy and/or practice of scheduling meal periods for Plaintiff and class members. As a result of
27 Defendants’ policies and/or practices, Plaintiff and class members had to work through some or all
28 of their meal periods, have their meal periods interrupted to return to work, and/or wait extended

1 periods of time before taking meal periods. Plaintiff and class members were asked by Defendants
2 to write on their timecards that they took their meal periods, when instead they were actually working
3 through them.

4 64. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and class members with second 30-minute meal
5 periods on days that they worked in excess of 10 hours in one day. Plaintiff worked 10 or more hour
6 shifts and, at times, up to 12 or more hours in a shift without being permitted or authorized to take a
7 second 30-minute meal period.

8 65. Plaintiff is also informed and believes that Defendants engaged in a systematic,
9 company-wide practice and/or policy of not paying meal period premiums for Plaintiff and class
10 members, regardless of whether they were able to take a compliant meal break, in violation of the
11 applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 (a). As a result, Defendants
12 failed to provide Plaintiff and class members compliant meal periods in violation of California Labor
13 Code sections 226.7 and 512 and failed to pay the full meal period premiums due.

14 66. As alleged herein, Plaintiff and the Class are not exempt from the meal period
15 requirements of the applicable Code of Regulations and Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.
16 Consequently, Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Order, and California Labor
17 Code §§ 226.7, 512 (a), and 1198. Plaintiff and class members are therefore entitled to recover from
18 Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work
19 day that the meal period was not provided, plus interest thereon and costs of suit in an amount subject
20 to proof at trial.

21 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
22 **FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY FOR NECESSARY EXPENDITURES**
23 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2802**
24 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

25 67. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as
26 though fully set forth herein.

27 68. An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
28 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his

1 or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

2 69. At all times relevant herein, Class Members have been required by Defendants to
3 purchase tools, and in fact did purchase tools in order to perform their duties.

4 70. At all times relevant herein, Defendants have had a uniform practice and policy of
5 paying their employees less than twice the minimum wage in contravention of the applicable IWC
6 Wage Orders and California Labor Code §§ 1182, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197.

7 71. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
8 Defendants have maintained a policy, practice, or a lack of policy, which resulted in their failure to
9 indemnify the Class for the reasonable expenses they incurred in the course of performing their duties.
10 Specifically, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times,
11 Defendants have not reimbursed Class Members for the purchase of their tools.

12 72. During the interview process with Defendants, Plaintiff was informed that he would
13 have to provide his own tools for the job. Plaintiff was being paid \$25 per hour. Plaintiff reported that
14 he was not being paid double minimum wage to his supervisor, RJ Lemke, even though he was
15 required to use his own tools to perform his job duties. RJ Lemke told Plaintiff that he did not qualify
16 for double minimum wage. Plaintiff had spent about \$3,000-\$3,500 on tools he purchased prior to
17 coming to work for Defendants that he used to perform his job duties. Plaintiff also had a toolbox that
18 he spent about \$400 on, which he also owned prior to his employment with the company. The tools
19 that Defendants actually provides to technicians are air hoses, water hoses, jacks, and jack stands.
20 However, the technicians are required to provide and use their own tools to perform their work.

21 73. As a result of the foregoing, all members of the Class are entitled to recover all sums
22 incurred by them for the purchase of the tools that were necessary for the performance of their jobs
23 and which they were required to purchase in an amount according to proof at trial.

24 74. As a result of the foregoing, Class members are further entitled to an award of interest
25 at the same rate as judgments in civil actions, accruing from the date on which they incurred the
26 necessary expenditures or loses and all reasonable costs, including attorney's fees incurred by them
27 for enforcing the rights granted by Labor Code § 2802.

28 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**FAILURE TO FURNISH ACCURATE WAGE STATEMENTS
AND FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE PAYROLL RECORDS
IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 226 1174 (d), and 1198
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

75. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

76. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174, employers have a duty to provide their non-exempt employees with accurate itemized statements showing total hours worked, hourly wages, gross wages, total deductions net wages earned and name of the employer. An employer who violates these Code sections is liable to its employees for the greater of actual damages suffered by the employee, or \$50.00 in civil penalties for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and \$100.00 per employee for each subsequent pay period, up to a statutory maximum of \$4,000.00.

77. “Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following: (1) Full name, home address, occupation and social security number ... (3) Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded.” IWC Wage Order 4-2001, section 7 (A) (1) & (3).

78. “Every person employing labor in this state shall: (c) Keep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors. (d) Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments.” Lab. Code § 1174 (c) & (d).

79. “Any person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of Section 1174 or accurate and complete records required by subdivision (d) of Section 1174 ... shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).” Cal. Lab. Code § 1174.5.

80. “A copy of the statement and the record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State

1 of California.” Cal. Lab. Code § 226 (a).

2 81. Pursuant to Labor Code § 558.1, any employer or other person acting on behalf of an
3 employer, who violates, or causes to be violated, Labor Code section 226, may be held liable as the
4 employer for such violation. The term ‘other person acting on behalf of an employer’ is limited to a
5 natural person who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent of the employer.

6 82. At all relevant times, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally provided Plaintiff
7 and Subclass members with uniform, incomplete, and inaccurate wage statements.

8 83. Because Defendants failed to document and deducted time worked from Plaintiff’s
9 and Subclass members’ wage statements and employment records for meal periods they did not
10 actually receive, Defendants unlawfully deducted wages earned and meal period premiums that
11 should have been paid. Thus, Defendants did not furnish wage statements to Plaintiff and Subclass
12 members containing the correct amount of gross wages earned in violation of Labor Code § 226 (a)
13 (1), accurate total hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226 (a) (2), correct amount of net wages
14 earned in violation of Labor Code § 226 (a) (5), or accurate number of hours worked at each
15 corresponding hourly rate in violation of Labor Code § 226 (a) (9).

16 84. To the extent that Defendants paid any meal break premium and/or rest break premium
17 payments, Defendants failed to identify such payments on Plaintiff’s and Subclass members’ wage
18 statements and employment records, and Defendants otherwise failed to provide information on the
19 wage statements sufficient to identify how many premium payments were paid during each pay
20 period, the specific dates worked giving rise to the premium payments owed, or to determine whether
21 such premium payments adequately and/or accurately compensated Plaintiff and Subclass members
22 for any and all premiums owed.

23 85. California Labor Code § 1198 provides that the maximum hours of work and the
24 standard conditions of labor shall be those fixed by the Labor Commissioner and as set forth in the
25 applicable IWC Wage Orders. § 1198 further provides that “the employment of any employees for
26 longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is
27 unlawful.” Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order, employers are required to keep accurate time
28 records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period and meal period. At all

1 relevant times, Defendants failed, on a company-wide basis, to keep records of meal period start and
2 stop times for Plaintiff and Subclass members in violation of section 1198.

3 86. California Labor Code section 1174 (d) provides that “every person employing labor
4 in this state shall ... keep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and
5 the ages of all minors” and “keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments
6 at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages
7 paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees
8 employed at the respective plants or establishments...” At all relevant times, and in violation of
9 Labor Code § 1174 (d), Defendants willfully failed to maintain accurate payroll records for Plaintiff
10 and Subclass members showing the daily hours they worked and the wages paid thereto as a result
11 of failing to record the off-the-clock hours that they worked.

12 87. Plaintiff and Subclass members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of
13 their actual damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226 (a),
14 or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars \$4,000 per employee, in addition to
15 attorneys’ fees and costs.

16 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES**

18 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 204**

19 88. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as
20 though fully set forth herein.

21 89. “All wages ... earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice
22 during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays
23 ... (d) The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly,
24 biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following
25 the close of the payroll period.” Labor Code § 204.

26 90. “In addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided
27 in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections ...
28 204 ... shall be subject to a penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100)

1 for each failure to pay each employee. (2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional
2 violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the
3 amount unlawfully withheld.” Labor Code § 210.

4 91. At all times relevant herein, Defendants engaged in a practice of failing to pay Plaintiff
5 and the Class by the seventh calendar day following the close of the payroll period. Indeed, as
6 discussed above, Plaintiff and the Class are owed wages for unpaid minimum wage, unpaid overtime,
7 meal periods, rest periods and unreimbursed business expenses. At no time during their employment
8 were these outstanding sums ever paid to them. Instead, these outstanding sums continued to
9 accumulate every pay period. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Class were not paid all wages earned by the
10 seventh calendar day following the close of their pay periods.

11 92. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ failure to timely pay wages, Plaintiff
12 and the Class are entitled to penalties under Labor Code § 210 in an amount subject to proof at trial.

13 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **WILLFUL FAILURE TO PAY WAGES**

15 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 201-203**

16 93. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as
17 though fully set forth herein.

18 94. “If an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of
19 discharge are due and payable immediately.” Labor Code § 201.

20 95. “If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
21 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless
22 the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the
23 employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.” Labor Code § 202.

24 96. “If an employer willfully fails to pay any wages of an employee who is discharged or
25 who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same
26 rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced.” Labor Code § 203.

27 97. Plaintiff and the Class were not exempt from the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-
28 203.

98. At no time since Plaintiff's or the Class's separation of employment did Defendants pay them wait-time penalties as required by Labor Code § 203.

99. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' willful failure to pay Plaintiff's and the Class's wages upon their separation of employment, Plaintiff and the Class incurred wait-time penalties in an amount equal to their daily rate of pay over the period that the wages were not paid in an amount subject to proof at trial.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF

BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE §§17200, ET SEQ.

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

100. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

101. Defendants are a “person” as defined by California Business & Professions Code sections 17201.

102. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, the Class, aggrieved employees and to the general public. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' unlawful business practices. Plaintiff and the Class seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

103. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law.

104. The employment practices engaged in by Defendant as plead herein, including violations of the Labor Code sections, Code of Regulations and Wage Orders, constitute unfair business practices in violation of Business & Professions Code §§17200, et seq.

105. As a result of Defendants' unfair business practices, Defendants have reaped unfair benefits and illegal profits at the expense of Plaintiff, the Class and members of the public.

106. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that

1 commences four years prior to the filing of this Complaint; a permanent injunction requiring
2 Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff, the Class and aggrieved employees; and an
3 award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other
4 applicable laws; and an award of costs.

5 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
6 **CIVIL PENALTIES IN VIOLATION OF**
7 **LABOR CODE § 2699, ET SEQ.**
8 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

9 107. Plaintiff incorporates, by reference, all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as
10 though fully set forth herein.

11 108. Under Labor Code § 2698, et seq., Plaintiff, as a aggrieved employee, may bring an
12 action against defendants, on behalf of himself and other current or former employees, seeking civil
13 penalties for defendants' violations of the California Labor Code.

14 109. Plaintiff was a aggrieved employee within the meaning of Labor Code §2698, et seq.
15 by virtue of the numerous Labor Code violations he was subjected to as plead herein.

16 110. Defendants also subjected the aggrieved employees on whose behalf Plaintiff brings
17 this enforcement action to all of the Labor Code violations plead herein, including failing to reimburse
18 for necessary business expenditures in violation of Labor Code § 2802, failing to pay minimum wages
19 in violation of Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198, failing to pay overtime in
20 violation Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198, failing to furnish compliant wage statements and maintain
21 accurate pay records in violation of § 226, 1174 (d), and 1198, failing to provide meal periods in
22 violation of §§ 226.7, 512 (a), and 1198, failure to timely pay wages in violation of Labor Code § 204
23 and willful failure to pay wages in violation of Labor Code § 201-203.

24 111. On November 2, 2022, Plaintiff provided written notice by online filing with the Labor
25 and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions
26 of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
27 violation, as required by Labor Code § 2699.3 (a) (1) (A).

28 112. As of the filing of this Complaint, Plaintiff has received no notice from the Labor and

1 Workforce Development Agency of its intent to pursue an action against Defendants.

2 113. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' California Labor Code violations as
3 set forth herein, Plaintiff is entitled to civil penalties of \$100 for each aggrieved employee per pay
4 period for the initial violation, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
5 subsequent violation, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (f), for those Labor Code sections not expressly
6 providing for a penalty, and civil penalties provided by the specific Labor Code sections that do
7 expressly provide for a penalty.

8 114. Plaintiff is also entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs, and 25% of the
9 recovered civil penalties.

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 Plaintiff and the Class pray for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

12 1. For damages, unpaid wages, penalties, injunctive relief, and attorneys' fees in excess
13 of \$25,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

14 **Class Certification**

- 15 2. That this case be certified as a class action;
16 3. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representatives of the Class and Subclass;
17 4. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as class counsel.

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

19 **(Unpaid Minimum Wages)**

20 5. That the Court adjudge, declare and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§
21 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, applicable Wage Orders and Codes of Regulation by willfully
22 failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and class members;

23 6. For payment of unpaid wages in an amount subject to proof;

24 7. For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code §1194.2 in an amount subject to proof,
25 plus interest;

26 8. For prejudgment interest at the legal rate from the date the obligation became due
27 through the date of judgment in this matter;

28 9. For all reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred by Plaintiff's and the Class's

1 enforcement of the rights granted by Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 pursuant
2 to Labor Code § 1194 (a); and

3 10. For such other relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

4 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

5 **(Unpaid Overtime)**

6 11. That the Court adjudge, declare and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§
7 510 and 1198, applicable IWC Wage Orders and Codes of Regulation by willfully failing to pay
8 overtime wages to Plaintiff and class members;

9 12. For payment of unpaid overtime wages in an amount subject to proof;

10 13. For prejudgment interest at the legal rate from the date the obligation became due
11 through the date of judgment in this matter;

12 14. For all reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred by Plaintiff's and the Class's
13 enforcement of the rights granted by Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 pursuant to Labor Code § 1194
14 (a); and

15 15. For such other relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

16 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

17 **(Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

18 16. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
19 Code §§ 226.7, 512 (a), 1198, applicable IWC Wage Orders and Codes of Regulation by willfully
20 failing to provide all meal periods to Plaintiff and class members;

21 17. That the Court make an award to the Plaintiff and class members of one hour of pay
22 at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

23 18. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

24 19. For premiums pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7 (b);

25 20. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid meal period premiums from the date such
26 amounts were due, or as otherwise provided by law;

27 21. For attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, or
28 as otherwise provided by law; and

1 22. For such other relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

2 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

3 **(Unreimbursed Business Expenses)**

4 23. That the Court adjudge, declare and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
5 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse business expenses incurred by Plaintiff and the Class;

6 24. For unreimbursed business expenses and for all actual, consequential, and incidental
7 losses and damages, according to proof;

8 25. For interest at the same rate as judgments in civil actions, accruing from the date on
9 which Plaintiff and the Class incurred the necessary expenditures or loses pursuant to Labor Code §
10 2802;

11 26. For all reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred by Plaintiff's and the Class's
12 enforcement of the rights granted by Labor Code § 2802 pursuant to Labor Code § 2802 (c); and

13 27. For such other relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

14 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

15 **(Noncompliant Wage Statements and Payroll Records)**

16 28. That the Court adjudge, declare and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§
17 226 and 1198, applicable IWC Wage Orders and Codes of Regulation by willfully failing to furnished
18 compliant, accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and class members and for failure to keep
19 accurate payroll records;

20 29. For consequential and incidental losses and damages according to proof;

21 30. For injunctive relief pursuant to Labor Code § 226 (h);

22 31. For statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226 (e);

23 32. For all reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred by Plaintiff's and the Class's
24 enforcement of the rights granted by Labor Code §§ 226 pursuant to Labor Code § 226 (e) (1); and

25 33. For such other relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

26 **As to the Sixth Cause of Action**

27 **(Failure to Timely Pay Wages)**

28 34. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor

1 Code § 204, applicable IWC Wage Orders and Codes of Regulation by willfully failing to timely pay
2 wages to Plaintiff and class members;

3 35. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 210, plus 25 percent of amounts unlawfully
4 withheld from Plaintiff and class members;

5 36. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

6 37. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due,
7 or as otherwise provided by law;

8 38. For attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, or
9 as otherwise provided by law; and

10 39. For such other relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

11 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action**

12 **(Willful Failure to Pay Wages)**

13 40. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
14 Code § 201-203, applicable IWC Wage Orders and Codes of Regulation by willfully failing to pay
15 minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest premiums owed to Plaintiff and class members
16 either upon discharge or within 72 hours of their resignation;

17 41. For wait time penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203;

18 42. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

19 43. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due,
20 or as otherwise provided by law;

21 44. For attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, or
22 as otherwise provided by law; and

23 45. For such other relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

24 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

25 **(Unfair Competition)**

26 46. That the employment practices engaged in by Defendants as plead herein, including
27 violations of the Labor Code, Code of Regulations and Wage Orders, constitute unfair business
28 practices in violation of Business & Professions Code §§17200, et seq.;

1 47. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all class members and prejudgment
2 interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

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

8 50. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and appropriate.

9 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action**

10 **(Civil Penalties under the PAGA)**

11 51. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated all California
12 Labor Code sections plead herein, including Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174,
13 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and 2802;

14 52. For civil penalties pursuant to 210, 226.3, 256, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2699 (a) and/or
15 2699 (a), (f) and (g), for violations of all California Labor Code sections plead herein, including Labor
16 Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198 and 2802;

17 53. For attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699 (g) (1), and
18 any and all other relevant statutes, for Defendants' violations of all California Labor Code sections
19 plead herein, including Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1197,
20 1197.1, 1198 and 2802;

21 54. For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law; and

22 55. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and appropriate.

23 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

24 Plaintiff and the Class hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues.
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PIMENTEL LAW, P.C.

Dated: January 9, 2023

By: 

Kelly M. Hatfield
Attorney for the Plaintiff