

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
aaron@bartzlawgroup.com
Rex Phillips (SBN 237747)
rex@bartzlawgroup.com
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413 / Fax: (949) 656-7760

Walter L. Haines, Esq. (SBN 71075)
walter@uelglaw.com
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Tel.: (562) 256-1047 / Fax: (562) 256-1006

Attorneys for Plaintiff ERNESTO TORRES and all others similarly situated

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

ERNESTO TORRES, an individual; on behalf
of himself and all others similarly situated and
the general public,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DAIOHS U.S.A., INC., a California
corporation, dba FIRST CHOICE COFFEE
SERVICES; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Sacramento

07/07/2025

By: A. Gray Deputy

Case No.: 25CV011200

[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Lauri A.
Damrell, Dept. 22]

CLASS ACTION

COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Violation of B&PC §17200, et seq.
2. Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198;
3. Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq.;
4. Failure to Pay Meal and Rest Break Premiums at the Proper Regular Rate of Pay (Labor Code §226.7)
5. Failure to Provide & Maintain Accurate Wage Statements Pursuant to Labor Code §226;
6. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §226.7); and
7. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code §226.7).
8. Failure to Reimburse Expenses (Lab. Code §2802);
9. Violation of Labor Code §§2698-2699 (PAGA)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff ERNESTO TORRES, on behalf of himself and all other persons similarly
2 situated, and the general public (hereinafter, "Plaintiffs"), hereby complains against Defendant
3 DAIOHS U.S.A., INC., a California corporation, dba FIRST CHOICE COFFEE SERVICES
4 ("Daiohs" and/ or "Defendant"), and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (hereinafter Daiohs and Does
5 1-100 are collectively referred to herein as "Defendants"), and on information and belief
6 allege as follows:

7 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

8 **JURISDICTION**

9 1. This is a civil action seeking recovery of unpaid wages, waiting time penalties,
10 pay stub penalties and meal and rest period premiums under California Labor Code §§ 510,
11 1194 et seq., 201 et seq., 226 and 226.7. Plaintiffs bring an action for monetary damages for
12 failure to pay wages as well as for restitution for Defendants' violations of Business and
13 Professions Code (B&PC) §17200, et seq., including full restitution of all compensation
14 retained by Defendants as a result of their unlawful, fraudulent and unfair business practices.
15 Plaintiffs seek all available relief, including full restitution of all compensation retained by
16 Defendants as a result of their unlawful and unfair business practices. Further, Plaintiffs seek
17 injunctive relief under B&PC §17200, et seq.

18 **VENUE**

19 2. Venue as to each of the Defendants is proper in this judicial district pursuant to
20 California Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts
21 complained of herein occurred in the County of Sacramento. Each defendant either owns,
22 maintains offices, transacts business, has an agent or agents within the County of Sacramento,
23 or otherwise is found within the County of Sacramento, and each defendant is within the
24 jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

25 **PARTIES**

26 3. Ernesto Torres ("Torres") is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all
27 relevant times herein, Plaintiff Torres worked for Defendants within the State of California.
28

1 4. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times
2 mentioned herein, Defendant Daiohs is and was a California corporation.

3 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times
4 mentioned herein, Defendant Daiohs was authorized to do business in the state of California,
5 County of Sacramento, and operates an office water and coffee service company.

6 6. Thus, each named defendant and DOES 1 to 100 are subject to B&PC §17200,
7 et seq. (Unfair Competition Law) and the Labor Code, as hereinafter alleged.

8 7. Plaintiffs do not know the true names or capacities, whether individual,
9 partner, or corporate, of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that
10 reason, those defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiffs will seek from
11 this Court leave to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered.
12 Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the Defendants and each
13 fictitious defendant, whether individual, partners, or corporate, was responsible in some
14 manner for the circumstances alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiffs and all others
15 similarly situated hereinafter alleged and the general public to be subjected to the unlawful
16 employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.

17 8. At all times herein mentioned, each of the Defendants participated in the doing
18 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore,
19 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every
20 one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein
21 mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Plaintiffs
22 herein allege that Defendants and each of them is the joint employer of Plaintiffs and the
23 classes.

24 9. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of
25 and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the
26 course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common
27 enterprise.
28

10. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants in proximately causing the complaints, injuries and damages alleged herein.

11. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants, thereby proximately causing the damages, as herein alleged.

12. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because both the individual and aggregate monetary damages and restitution sought herein exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established at trial, according to proof. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because Plaintiffs and the putative classes herein worked within the State of California, and were subject to California's wage and hour laws.

PLAINTIFF CLASSES

13. The class representative Plaintiff who worked in the position of an hourly non-exempt employees or other similar title while employed by Defendants within the State of California, is as follows:

a. Ernesto Torres

Plaintiff Torres worked within California as a non-exempt hourly employee for Defendants between October 2023 and March 2025. Plaintiff Torres typically worked Monday through Friday during this time as a full-time employee.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

14. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated as a class action pursuant to CCP §382. The Classes which Plaintiffs seek to represent are composed of and defined as follows:

Class 1:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from 2021 through the date of judgment, who were not paid premium overtime and/or double time at the employee's regular rate of pay.

Subclass 1:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California who were paid for a missed meal or rest period at an allegedly "reduced" rate of pay from 2021 through the date of judgment (Meal and Rest Reduced Rate Subclass);

Class 2:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from 2021 through the date of judgment, who were not paid the minimum wage for all hours worked (Minimum Wage Class);

Class 3:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California and who worked at some point from 2022 through the present, who are no longer employed with Defendants and to whom Defendants willfully failed to pay all wages due upon separation from Defendants (Waiting Time Penalty Class);

Class 4:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from 2021 to the present who were not provided legally compliant meal periods (Meal Break Class);

Class 5:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from 2021 through the present who were not provided legally-compliant rest breaks (Rest Break Class);

Class 6:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from

2024 through the present who were provided a paystub (a.k.a. wage statement) which failed to list all hours actually worked and wages owed (Pay Stub Class).

Class 7:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from 2021 through the present who were not reimbursed for their necessary and reasonable business expenses (Reimbursement Class).

The members of the classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the classes is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time; however, it is estimated that the classes number greater than 100 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records.

15. There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:

- i. Whether Defendants paid their employees proper premium overtime and/or double time at the employees' regular rate for hours over eight (8) in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week, in paying their hourly non-exempt employees;
- ii. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions including §510, 1194, and 203 by requiring substantial overtime work and not paying for said work according to the overtime laws of the State of California;
- iii. Whether Defendants failed to pay the appropriate premium overtime compensation to the hourly employees;
- iv. Whether Defendants improperly retained, appropriated or deprived Plaintiffs and the class members of the use of monies or sums to which Plaintiffs and the class were legally entitled;
- v. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices;

- vi. Whether Defendants, and each of them, were participants in the alleged unlawful conduct;
- vii. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- viii. The effect upon and the extent of injuries suffered by Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated and the appropriate amount of compensation;
- ix. The appropriate amount of monetary penalties allowed by Labor Code §201, et. seq.;
- x. Whether Defendants pay and continue to pay for missed meal and rest period premiums at an allegedly "reduced" rate of pay in violation of Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders;
- xi. Whether Defendants failed and refused to reimburse Plaintiff and the class members for their reasonable and necessary expenses incurred in fulfilling their work duties for Defendant
- xii. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §226 and relevant IWC Wage Orders by failing to, among other violations, accurately report total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly work, by Plaintiffs and the members of the Class; and
- xiii. Whether Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to maintain records for Plaintiffs and members of the Class as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

16. Plaintiff Torres' claims are typical of the claims of all members of the classes and subclasses mentioned herein, and the relief sought is typical of the relief which would be brought by members of the Class in separate actions. Plaintiff Torres and the members of the Class sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of laws and regulations that have force and effect of law and statutes alleged herein. Plaintiff Torres, as a representative party, will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the classes by vigorously pursuing this suit through his attorneys who

1 are skilled and experienced in handling matters of this type. Plaintiff Torres has no claim or
2 interest that is antagonistic to any class member.

3 17. The nature of this action and the nature of laws available to the members of the
4 classes and subclasses identified herein make use of the class action format a particularly
5 efficient and appropriate procedure to afford relief to Plaintiffs for the wrongs alleged herein.
6 Further, this claim involves large corporate employer, Defendant Daiohs, and a large number
7 of individual employees (Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated) with many relatively
8 small claims with common issues of law and fact. If each employee were required to file an
9 individual lawsuit, the corporate defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable
10 advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each
11 individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Requiring each
12 class member to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful
13 claims by employees who would be disinclined to pursue an action against their present
14 and/or former employer for an appreciable and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent
15 damage to their careers at present and/or subsequent employment. Proof of a common
16 business practice or factual pattern, of which the Plaintiffs experienced, is representative of
17 the class mentioned herein and will establish the right of each of the members of the named
18 class to recovery on the causes of action alleged herein.

19 18. The prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if
20 possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
21 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would
22 establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or (b) legal
23 determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter,
24 be dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which
25 would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests.
26 Further, the claims of the individual members of the class are not sufficiently large to warrant
27 vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses
28 attending thereto.

1 19. Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated are entitled to the wages and other
2 monies unlawfully withheld. This action is brought for the benefit of the public.

3 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Violation of B&PC §17200, et seq.)**

5 20. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
6 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

7 21. Beginning on an exact date unknown to Plaintiffs but believed to have
8 occurred from 2021 on, Defendants have engaged in a pattern and practice of acts of unfair
9 competition in violation of B&PC §17200, including the practices alleged herein.

10 22. Defendants, and each of them, own and operate office water and coffee
11 services, respectively in California, and have engaged in the practice of paying their non-
12 exempt employees, in a fashion that circumvents California's wage and hour laws.

13 **FAILURE TO PAY PROPER WAGES AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION**

14 23. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon alleges that as part of Defendants'
15 ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants' hourly employees worked in excess of eight
16 (8) hours per day, and excess of forty (40) hours per week without receiving the proper
17 regular rate of pay and therefore have failed to receive overtime compensation and/or the
18 proper overtime premium. Defendants are therefore in violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and
19 1194, and the relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

20 24. Defendants, and each of them, consistently administered a corporate policy
21 regarding off-the-clock work, which required that employees work overtime without proper
22 premium overtime pay, the regular rate of pay, and/or minimum wage. This corporate policy
23 and pattern of conduct is accomplished with the advanced knowledge and designed intent to
24 avoid paying non-exempt employees for all hours worked. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the
25 class members are entitled to all unpaid wages due under California law. Further, Plaintiffs
26 and the class are entitled to restitution of these wages obtained by Defendants, and each of
27 them.
28

1 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 200, ET SEQ.**

2 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that as part of
3 Defendants' ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants failed to provide all employees all
4 wages at the time of their separation in violation of Labor Code § 200, et. seq., including but
5 not limited to, §§201, 202, 203 & 204.

6 26. Labor Code § 200, et seq. provides that an employer is required to pay an
7 employee all wages (including accrued vacation) immediately upon the employee's
8 involuntary separation from employment; immediately upon his or her voluntary separation if
9 the employee gave at least seventy-two (72) hours notice, and within seventy-two (72) hours,
10 if the employee voluntarily separated, but did not give at least seventy-two (72) hours notice.

11 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that all employees who
12 have been separated from Defendants did not timely receive a final paycheck detailing the
13 proper amount of pay from Defendants in violation of Labor Code § 200, et. seq.

14 28. Pursuant to Labor Code § 200, et seq. employees that no longer work for
15 Defendants, and who were not timely paid, are entitled to one (1) day of pay in penalties for
16 each day that he or she was paid late, until payment was made, up to a maximum of thirty (30)
17 days.

18 **VIOLATION OF MEAL AND REST PERIOD PROVISIONS**

19 29. Defendants' improper meal and rest period policies are in violation of
20 California law including, but not limited to Labor Code § 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC
21 Wage Orders. Plaintiffs and the class were entitled to 1 hour of pay for each meal and rest
22 break violation at their regular rate of pay. Defendants failed and continue to fail to pay for
23 meal and rest period violations at the employees' regular rate of pay in violation of Section 11
24 of the applicable Wage Orders.

25 30. Plaintiffs seek restitution and injunctive relief for said violations.

26 31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all times herein
27 mentioned, Defendants have engaged in unlawful, deceptive, and unfair business practices
28 prohibited by California B&PC §17200, thereby depriving their employees and the putative

1 class the minimum working standards and conditions due to them under the California labor
2 laws and Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders as specifically described herein.
3 Plaintiffs seek an injunction preventing Defendants from continuing their unfair business
4 practice of improperly depriving their employees of overtime pay, and payment of their
5 regular rate of pay for meal and rest period premiums. Plaintiffs further seek an order
6 requiring Defendants to identify by full name, telephone number, and last known address
7 employees who worked or still work for Defendants between 2021 through the date of
8 judgment; Plaintiffs further seek an order requiring Defendants to timely pay restitution to all
9 current and former employees, including back wages, premium payments, and interest.

10 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

11 32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that as part of
12 Defendants' ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants, and each of them, fail to provide
13 their employees with proper and understandable itemized wage statement, as required by Labor
14 Code § 226.

15 33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants, and
16 each of them, fail to provide each employee with an itemized statement which states the actual
17 regular rate paid, the total hours worked by the employee, the gross and net wages earned, and
18 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
19 hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

20 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**

21 34. Defendants have adopted and implemented an illegal reimbursement policy
22 that fails to compensate Plaintiffs for all necessary business expenses incurred in discharging
23 their duties for Defendants.

24 35. Defendants' conduct in failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the class for their
25 necessary business expenses is also unfair within the meaning of Business and Professions
26 Code §17200 because it is against established public policy and has been pursued to attain an
27 unjustified monetary advantage for Defendants by unfairly and unlawfully reducing Plaintiffs
28

1 and the other class members' compensation, as Plaintiffs and the class are required to come
2 out of pocket for such expenses. As such, Defendants' business practices, including their
3 illegal reimbursement policy and practice, is unfair, illegal and fraudulent, in that such policy
4 and practice was intended to reduce Plaintiffs' and the class' due and owing compensation.

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **RECOVERY OF UNPAID WAGES & PENALTIES**

7 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

8 36. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
9 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

10 37. Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated identified herein were and are
11 employed and scheduled as a matter of established company policy to work and in fact
12 worked as non-exempt hourly employees in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or in excess
13 of forty (40) hours per week. Defendants employed and scheduled all employees without
14 providing overtime compensation for such excess hours worked in violation of Labor Code §§
15 510 and 1194 and the relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) orders.
16 Labor Code § 204 establishes the fundamental right of all employees in the State of California
17 to be paid the proper amount of wages in a timely fashion for their work, including overtime.
18 Defendants always had a written and verbal agreement to pay overtime and double time based
19 on the Plaintiffs' and classes' regular rate of pay.

20 38. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218 and 1194(a), Plaintiffs may bring a civil action
21 for overtime wages directly against the employer without first filing a claim with the Division
22 of Labor Standards Enforcement (hereinafter "DLSE") and may recover such wages, together
23 with interest thereon, penalties, attorneys' fees and costs.

24 39. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants have failed to pay to Plaintiffs and all
25 persons similarly situated wages when due as required by Labor Code § 204.

26 40. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer
27 than the hours set by the IWC or under conditions prohibited by the applicable IWC Wage
28 Orders.

1 41. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon
2 allege that Defendants have treated Plaintiffs as hourly non-exempt employees. Despite this
3 classification, Defendants have willfully violated the Labor Code with respect to meeting the
4 requirements of paying one (1) regular rate of pay and calculating overtime and double time
5 based on that regular rate, as herein before alleged. Defendants have failed to properly pay
6 premium overtime for hours worked in a week, and as such, Defendants are able to reduce
7 their overhead and operating expenses and gain an unfair advantage over competing
8 companies complying with state law. Furthermore, Defendants have failed to include all
9 items of remuneration when determining the employees' regular rate of pay, as described
10 above.

11 42. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants
12 consistently administered a corporate policy regarding both staffing levels and duties and
13 responsibilities of the members of the classes which required the entirety of all classes to work
14 overtime without proper premium pay, and to fail all wages for hours worked. This corporate
15 policy and pattern of conduct was/is accomplished with the advance knowledge and design of
16 all Defendants herein. Thus, Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated routinely, regularly
17 and customarily performed overtime work and/or work that they failed to be compensated at
18 the appropriate hourly wage.

19 43. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the obligations and
20 responsibilities of the class employees are irrelevant because Plaintiffs and all others similarly
21 situated merely allege wrongdoing with Defendants' pay plans, policies and practices.
22 Further, the duties of Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated are not relevant in certifying
23 any of the classes.

24 44. Defendants, and each of them, had a consistent and uniform policy, practice
25 and procedure of willfully failing to pay the earned and unpaid wages of all such non-exempt
26 employees. Defendants have willfully failed to pay the earned and unpaid wages of such
27 individuals, including, but not limited to regular pay, premium pay, and other wages earned
28 and remaining uncompensated according to amendment, or proof.

1 45. The pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding
2 illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to
3 recovery by Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated, in a civil action, for the unpaid balance
4 of the full amount of all wages owing, including the proper calculation of the regular rate and
5 the proper overtime premiums calculated at 1.5 or 2 times the legal regular rate which are
6 owing, including interest thereon, willful penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of
7 suit according to the mandate of Labor Code § 1194, et. seq.

8 46. Likewise, Defendants have a pattern, practice and uniform administration of
9 corporate policy regarding failure to comply with the required provisions of Labor Code §
10 226.7, in failing to pay Plaintiffs and the class the meal and rest period premium payments at
11 the regular rate.

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq.)**

14 47. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
15 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

16 48. Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq., provides that an employer is required to pay an
17 employee all wages (including accrued vacation) immediately upon an employee's
18 involuntary separation from employment; immediately upon his or her voluntary separation if
19 the employee gave at least seventy two (72) hours notice, and within seventy two (72) hours,
20 if the employee voluntarily separated, but did not give at least seventy two (72) hours notice.

21 49. Plaintiff Torres and other former employees of Defendants employed in the
22 State of California separated from employment with Defendants, and did not timely receive a
23 final pay check with all of their wages due from Defendants in violation of Labor Code
24 §§200, et seq. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants also
25 violated the mandates of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq., as to other employees whose
26 employment ended during the period of time covered by this action. Plaintiffs are informed
27 and believe and thereon allege that Defendants had the ability to pay all wages earned by
28 Plaintiffs and the members of the Class at the time of separation of employment in accordance

1 with Labor Code §§ 200, et seq. but intentionally adopted policies or practices incompatible
2 with the requirements of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq. resulting in the failure to pay all wages
3 earned prior to the separation of employment.

4 50. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq., each member of the class that no
5 longer works for Defendants, and who was not timely paid all of his or her wages due is
6 entitled to one (1) day of pay in penalties for each day that he or she was paid late, until
7 payment was made, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

8 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **FAILURE TO PAY MEAL AND REST PERIOD PREMIUMS AT THE PROPER**
10 **REGULAR RATE OF PAY**

11 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512, et seq.)**

12 51. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
13 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

14 52. Plaintiffs believe and thereon allege that Labor Code §226.7 requires an
15 employer to pay an additional hour of compensation at the employee's regular rate of pay for
16 each meal period and rest period violation. During the class period, Plaintiffs are informed
17 and believe, and based thereon allege that Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiffs and the
18 class members meal period and rest period premium pay at their regular rate of pay.
19 Defendants' improper meal and rest period practices and policies are in violation of California
20 law including, but not limited to Labor Code § § 226.7, 512, and the IWC Wage Orders.

21 53. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.7, Plaintiffs are entitled to damages in an amount
22 equal to one (1) hour of the employee's regular rate of pay per each meal and rest period
23 violation, in a sum to be proven at trial.

24 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

26 **(Violation of Labor Code § 226)**

27 54. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
28 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

1 55. Labor Code §226(a) provides, in pertinent part:

2 An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall
3 furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or
4 voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by
5 personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1)
6 gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as
7 provided in subdivision (j), (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any
8 applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all
9 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
10 employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6)
11 the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name
12 of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security
13 number or an employee identification number other than a social security
14 number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if
15 the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section
16 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the
17 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
18 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
19 employee. . . .

20 56. During the Class Period, Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to
21 provide the Class Members, including Plaintiff Torres, with timely and accurate wage and
22 hour statements showing gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions made, net
23 wages earned, the name and address of the legal entity employing that Class Member, and all
24 applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of
25 hours worked at each hourly rate by that Class Member.

26 57. The Class Members, including Plaintiffs, suffered injury as a result of
27 Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to provide the Class Members, with the wage and
28 hour statements required by law.

 58. Based on Defendants' conduct as alleged herein, Defendants are liable for actual
damages, statutory damages and/or statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §
226, attorney's fees and costs and other applicable provisions of the Labor Code and
applicable Wage Order.

(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512)

62. Plaintiffs and members of the Class were not provided with or given the opportunity to take the requisite meal periods before the end of the first 5 hours of work, nor were they provided with or given the opportunity to take a proper second meal period during the days when they worked more than 10 hours in a day. Defendants coerced Plaintiffs and the members of the Class to forego meal periods by disciplining and/or threatening disciplinary action against them if they attempted to take meal periods, created incentives to forego meal breaks, and encouraged the skipping of meal periods by scheduling work to coincide with the meal periods, among other things. In addition, Defendants placed unnecessarily tight timelines on Plaintiffs' work, forcing them to miss their meal periods in order to complete their jobs. As a result, Plaintiff and members of the Class were required to work and/or were not relieved of all duties during any meal period taken, and thus were

1 considered “on duty;” however, Defendants failed to count as time worked any “on duty”
2 meal period taken by Plaintiff and the members of the Class..

3 63. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c) and IWC Wage Orders, if an
4 employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable
5 provisions of the IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay
6 at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday that the meal period is not provided.
7 As such, Plaintiffs and members of the Class are entitled to an additional one hour’s pay for
8 each day in which Plaintiffs and members of the Class were not provided a proper meal break
9 under the above-described authorities.

10 64. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class request that the Court award interest on
11 all unpaid wages at the legal rate specified by California Civil Code § 3289(b), accruing from
12 the date the wages were due and payable pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6.

13 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE OR PERMIT REST PERIODS**

15 **(Violation of Labor Code § 226.7)**

16 65. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
17 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

18 66. The applicable IWC Wage Orders state that every employer shall authorize and
19 permit all employees to take rest periods. The authorized rest period time shall be based on
20 the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four hours of
21 work, or major fraction thereof. An employer must provide employees with 10 minutes’ rest
22 for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
23 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.

24 67. Plaintiff and Class Members were not permitted to take rest periods, were
25 required to work during their rest periods, and/or were disciplined and/or were advised that
26 they would be disciplined if they took rest periods during work hours, in contravention of
27 California law. Moreover, based on Defendants’ compensation plans, Plaintiff and Class
28

1 Members were not separately compensated for their rest periods as required under California
2 law.

3 68. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c) and the applicable IWC Wage
4 Orders, if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the
5 applicable IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
6 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

7 69. As such, Plaintiffs and the Class members are entitled to an additional one
8 hour's pay for each day in which they were not provided a proper rest period under the above-
9 described authorities.

10 70. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class request that the Court award interest on
11 all unpaid wages at the legal rate specified by California Civil Code § 3289(b), accruing from
12 the date the wages were due and payable pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6.

13 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**

15 **(Violation of (Labor Code § 2802)**

16 71. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
17 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

18 72. California Labor Code § 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his
19 or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
20 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties."

21 73. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all relevant times
22 Plaintiffs and the class members incurred certain expenses for their jobs with Defendants,
23 including but not limited to using their personal cell-phones to make and receive calls and text
24 messages for work assignments and company business. Despite this, Defendants failed and
25 refused to indemnify Plaintiffs and the class for all of their expenditures in carrying out their
26 duties for Defendants.

1 74. As a result of Defendants' failure to indemnify Plaintiffs and the class
2 members, they have suffered losses according to proof, including prejudgment interest, costs,
3 and attorneys' fees in prosecuting this case.

4 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

6 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699)**

7 75. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
8 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

9 76. On or about April 29, 2025, Plaintiff Torres provided written notice to the
10 Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendants of the specific
11 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
12 support the alleged violations.

13 77. The LWDA failed to respond to Plaintiffs' counsel's correspondence and failed
14 to notify Plaintiffs' counsel as to whether it would investigate the allegations contained
15 therein, within the time period requirements of the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA),
16 under Labor Code §2699.3. Plaintiffs have fully complied with the notice requirements set
17 forth in Labor Code §2699.3 in order to commence a civil action against an employer
18 pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

19 78. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs for all hours worked, minimum wages,
20 overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest
21 periods, failure to pay all wages upon termination or resignation, and failure to provide
22 accurate itemized wage statements, will subject Defendants to civil penalties pursuant to,
23 without limitation, Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 245, 246, 510, 512, 551, 552,
24 1174, 1194, 1198 and IWC Wage Orders.

25 79. Plaintiffs are aggrieved employees as defined in Labor Code §§2699(a) and
26 (c), and related Labor Code provisions. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of
27 themselves, as private attorneys general, and in a representative capacity on behalf of other
28 aggrieved employees, affected by the labor law violations alleged herein.

1 80. Defendants committed numerous violations of the California Labor Code and
2 IWC Wage Orders against the Plaintiffs, and on information and belief, against members of
3 the Class and other current and former employees while they were employed by Defendants,
4 including but not limited to:

5 a. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 510, 511, 1194 and/or IWC Wage Orders
6 by failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
7 current and former employees of Defendants, all minimum, straight time and overtime wages
8 owed in compliance with California law;

9 b. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 1194, 1197 and/or IWC Wage
10 Orders by failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class by failing to pay for a missed
11 meal or rest period at the regular rate of pay;

12 c. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
13 failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
14 current and former employees of Defendants, all minimum wages owed in compliance with
15 California law;

16 d. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 204, 510, 511 and/or IWC Wage
17 Orders by failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and
18 belief, other current and former employees of Defendants, all wages owed in a timely manner
19 in compliance with California law;

20 e. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7, 512, and /or IWC Wage Orders by
21 failing to provide Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
22 current and former employees of Defendants, the opportunity to take the requisite meal
23 periods in compliance with California law;

24 f. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
25 failing to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information
26 and belief, other current and former employees of Defendants, the opportunity to take the
27 requisite rest periods in compliance with California law;

28 g. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226, 1174 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
failing to properly maintain accurate employment time and records, maintain and/or submit
accurate itemized wage statements on behalf of Plaintiffs, members of the Class, and on

1 information and belief, on behalf of other current and former employees of Defendants as
2 described herein;

3 h. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
4 failing to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and on information and belief, other current and former
5 employees of Defendants as described herein; and

6 i. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 and/or the IWC Wage Orders by
7 failing to pay Plaintiffs and other members of the Class all of their reasonable and necessary
8 expenses.

9 81. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiffs, members of the Class, and all other
10 aggrieved current and former employees seek to recover civil penalties, as otherwise
11 provided by statute and wage order, for which Defendants are liable as a result of their
12 violations of the California Labor Code and applicable wage order(s) in an amount to be
13 proven at trial. These penalties include, but are not limited to, those provided by Labor Code
14 §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 245, 246, 256, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194,
15 1197, 2699, and IWC Wage Orders. Plaintiffs and aggrieved current and former employees
16 further seek and award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2698
17 and 2699.

18 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray:

20 1. That the Court determine this action may be maintained as a class action;

21 As to the First Cause of Action:

22 2. For an order preliminarily and permanently enjoining Defendants from
23 engaging in the practices challenged herein;

24 3. An order for full restitution of all monies, as necessary and according to proof,
25 to restore any and all monies withheld by the Defendants by means of the unfair practices
26 complained of herein. Plaintiffs seek, on behalf of the putative class, the appointment of a
27 receiver, as necessary. The restitution includes all monies retained as wages, as defined in
28 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 510 and 1194, and interest, and attorneys' fees as a result of the
unfair business practices;

1 4. For an order finding and declaring that Defendants' acts and practices as
2 challenged herein are unlawful, and unfair and/or fraudulent;

3 5. For an accounting, under administration of Plaintiffs and subject to court
4 supervision, to determine the amount to be returned by Defendants and the amounts to be
5 refunded to members who are or were not paid all their wages due to Defendants' unfair
6 business practices;

7 6. For the creation of an administrative process wherein each injured current and
8 former employee receives his or her back wages in the form of overtime pay or alternatively
9 that each current or former eligible employee may submit a claim in order to receive his/her
10 money;

11 7. For an order requiring Defendants to make full restitution and payment
12 pursuant to B&PC §§ 17200, et seq.;

13 8. For all other appropriate declaratory and equitable relief;

14 9. For pre-judgment interest to the extent permitted by law;

15 10. For an order requiring Defendants to identify, by name, address and telephone
16 number of each person who worked in California as an hourly non-exempt employee for
17 Defendants between 2021 through the time of judgment;

18 11. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

19 **As to the Second and Fourth Cause of Action:**

20 12. For damages according to proof, as set forth in Labor Code §§ 510, 226.7 and
21 1194, et seq., (and the applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders)
22 regarding wages due and owing;

23 13. For pre-judgment interest as allowed by Labor Code § 1194 and California
24 Civil Code § 3287(b), for waiting time penalties as authorized by Labor Code § 203, and for
25 reasonable attorneys' fees;

26 14. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.
27
28

1 **As to the Third Cause of Action:**

2 15. For waiting time penalties for all former employees not timely paid their last
3 pay check, including vacation pay;

4 16. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

5 17. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

6 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action:**

7 18. For recovery as authorized by Labor Code §226(e);

8 19. For injunctive relief to ensure Defendants' compliance with Labor Code §226
9 and the IWC Wage Orders §7(A) pursuant to Labor Code §226(h);

10 20. For an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code
11 §226(e) and/or §226(h);

12 21. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

13 **As to the Sixth Cause of Action:**

14 22. One (1) hour of pay at each of the employees' regular rate of compensation for
15 each workday that a meal period was not provided, impeded, discouraged and/or dissuaded;

16 23. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

17 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action:**

18 24. One (1) hour of pay at each of the employees' regular rate of compensation for
19 each workday that a rest period was not authorized or permitted, or impeded, interrupted,
20 discouraged and/or dissuaded;

21 25. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

22 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action:**

23 26. For recovery of all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by Plaintiffs and
24 the class members, according to proof;

25 27. For pre-judgment interest as allowed by Labor Code §§ 218.6, 1194(a), and
26 Civil Code § 3287;

27 28. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §
28 2802(c);

1 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action:**

2 29. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
3 Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2698 and 2699;

4 30. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law;

5 31. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
6 California Labor Code § 2699(g); and

7 32. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
8 appropriate.

9 **As to All Causes of Action:**

10 33. For reasonable costs incurred;

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

12
13 Dated: July 7, 2025

BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC

14
15 By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
16 AARON A. BARTZ
17 Attorneys for Plaintiff ERNESTO TORRES
18 and all others similarly situated
19
20
21
22
23
24
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

Dated: July 7, 2025

By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
AARON A. BARTZ
Attorneys for Plaintiff ERNESTO TORRES
and all others similarly situated