

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

William C. Sung, SB# 280792

E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com

Tiffany L. Luu, SB# 335127

E-Mail: tluu@justiceforworkers.com

Joseph C. Ramli, SB# 339491

E-Mail: jramli@justiceforworkers.com

9575 Bolsa Avenue

Westminster, CA 92683

Tel: 323-922-2000

Fax: 323-922-2000

Attorneys for Plaintiff NATHAN WILLIAMS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

NATHAN WILLIAMS, an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATES LOGISTICS SERVICES, INC., a
California corporation; KELLY SERVICES
GLOBAL, LLC, a Michigan limited liability
company; and DOES 1 through 50,

Defendants.

Case No.: CIVSB2510823

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

- (1) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);
- (2) **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194,
1198);
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);
- (5) **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE § 226);
- (6) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);
- (7) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and**
- (8) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
CALIFORNIA PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff NATHAN WILLIAMS (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all others similarly
2 situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint
3 (“Complaint”) against STATES LOGISTICS SERVICES, INC. (“Defendant SLS”), a California
4 corporation; KELLY SERVICES GLOBAL, LLC (“Defendant KSG”), a Michigan limited liability
5 company; and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as
6 follows:

7 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this
9 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions
10 Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194,
11 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2698, *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 7-2001
12 (“Wage Order 7”), in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution. This
13 Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has
14 jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy
15 exceeds \$25,000.

16 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have
17 agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including San Bernardino County, and
18 some of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in San Bernardino County.
19 Furthermore, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within San Bernardino County.

20 **PARTIES**

21 3. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant herein was, an individual over the age of
22 eighteen (18) and is a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to
23 each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee.
24 Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or customs complained of
25 herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et*
26 *seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198,
27 2698, *et seq.*, and Wage Order 7.

28 ///

1 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
2 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,
3 Defendants engaged in, and continue to engage in, business, and employed Plaintiff and other,
4 similarly-situated non-exempt employees within San Bernardino County, and the State of California
5 and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in San Bernardino County and the State of California.

6 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
7 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said
8 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
9 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed and
10 believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
11 partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
12 and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined below) to be subject to the unlawful
13 employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

14 6. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
15 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,
16 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
17 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
18 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

19 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
20 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
21 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within
22 the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent
23 said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining
24 Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

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

28 ///

1 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
2 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
3 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged.

4 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 10. Defendant SLS owns and operates a distribution warehouses in California, including
6 Fontana, California. Defendant KSG is a staffing agency. Defendant KSG employed Plaintiff and
7 placed Plaintiff to work with Defendant SLS, and Defendant SLS employed Plaintiff through the
8 agency, from approximately February 3 to March 6, 2025 as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee
9 in Fontana, California.

10 11. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants' timekeeping
11 and/or payroll policies and practices resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being
12 compensated for all hours actually worked. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees regularly
13 worked more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a workweek. Upon information and
14 belief, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed to properly calculate and compensate
15 overtime hours worked based on their definition of the workday and workweek. Upon information
16 and belief, Defendants required Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to perform work before
17 their scheduled shifts, after their scheduled shifts, and/or during off-the-clock meal breaks,
18 including waiting outside the facility to be let in the building by a Defendant SLS representative,
19 and failed to compensate employees for this time. As a result, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
20 employees were not compensated for all earned minimum and overtime wages.

21 12. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all
22 legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which have
23 frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes),
24 and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
25 employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed
26 by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate records of Plaintiff's
27 and other non-exempt employees' hours worked, including accurate time records showing when
28 employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt

1 employees were not provided with all legally compliant meal periods to which they were entitled,
2 Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with the required meal
3 period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code
4 § 226.7.

5 13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take
6 all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices, which failed to
7 authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction
8 thereof. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant rest
9 breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other
10 non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods
11 to which they were entitled, Defendants failed to compensate them with the required rest period
12 premium(s) for each workday there was a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.
13 Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of rest period
14 premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally compliant rest
15 period was not authorized and permitted to their non-exempt employees.

16 14. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, failure to
17 pay all meal and rest period premium wages, and unlawful timekeeping and payroll practices as
18 alleged above, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage
19 statements to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees. As a further result of Defendants' failure to
20 pay all minimum and overtime wages, nd meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to
21 timely pay all final wages to other former non-exempt employees upon their separation of
22 employment from Defendants.

23 15. Labor Code § 1198 provides: "The employment of any employee ... under conditions
24 of labor prohibited by the [Industrial Wage Orders] is unlawful." Section 15 of the Wage Order
25 provides: "(A) The temperature maintained in each work area shall provide reasonable comfort
26 consistent with industry-wide standards for the nature of the process and the work performed. (B) If
27 excessive heat or humidity is created by the work process, the employer shall take all feasible
28 means to reduce such excessive heat or humidity to a degree providing reasonable comfort. Where

1 the nature of the employment requires a temperature of less than 60° F, a heated room shall be
2 provided to which employees may retire for warmth, and such room shall be maintained at not less
3 than 68° F. (C) A temperature of not less than 68° F shall be maintained in the toilet rooms, resting
4 rooms, and change rooms during hours of use. (D) Federal and State energy guidelines shall prevail
5 over any conflicting provision of this section.” California law requires an employer to endeavor to
6 provide a safe and healthy workplace. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, §3203.) Labor Code § 6720 required
7 the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (“Cal/OSHA”) to propose an indoor heat
8 illness standard by January 1, 2019. Cal/OSHA has implemented standards for indoor heat illness
9 that applies to an indoor work area where the temperature or heat index equals or exceeds 87° F
10 when employees are present. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3396.) During the relevant time period,
11 Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with reasonable comfort by
12 maintaining the indoor temperature within the range of industry standards by, inter alia, complying
13 with Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3396 and failed to maintain a temperature of not less than 68° F in
14 rest rooms and breakrooms for Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

15 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

16 16. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following
17 Classes pursuant to § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure:

- 18 a. Direct Hire Class: All current and former non-exempt employees directly hired and
19 employed by Defendant SLS in the State of California from July 21, 2024 through
20 the present.
- 21 b. Staffing Agency Class: All current and former non-exempt employees placed to
22 work for Defendant SLS by staffing agencies, including but not limited to,
23 Defendant KSG, in the State of California during the four years immediately
24 preceding the filing of this action through the present.

25 17. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The members of the Classes are so numerous that
26 joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The membership of the Classes is
27 unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number
28 greater than 50 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection

of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

18. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of Interest:** There are predominant common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and members of the Classes, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:

- a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes;
- b. Whether Defendants paid at least the minimum wage for all hours worked to members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes;
- c. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period premium wages due to members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- d. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
- e. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes pursuant to Labor Code § 226; and
- f. Whether Defendants timely paid all final wages to members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes at the time of their separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

These common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class member's showing as to their eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of their damages.

19. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s) of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not paid all minimum and overtime wages owed due

1 to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies/practices, not provided all required meal periods,
2 not authorized and permitted all rest periods, did not receive premium pay for non-compliant meal
3 and rest periods, and not provided with accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements.

4 20. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps
5 to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's
6 attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes
7 and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have litigated numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and
8 federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the
9 members of the Classes.

10 21. **Superiority:** The Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important
11 public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws
12 and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who
13 have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic
14 and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this
15 action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class
16 action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged
17 herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily
18 gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited
19 resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

20 22. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) to pursue an individual remedy
21 would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file
22 an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and
23 permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. The claims of the individual
24 members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution
25 considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending hereto.

26 23. Furthermore, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members,
27 even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
28 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish

1 potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with
2 respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest
3 of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or
4 impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. As such, the Classes identified
5 hereinabove are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

8 **(Against All Defendants)**

9 24. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
10 fully set forth herein.

11 25. Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1197, and Wage Order 7, § 4 establish the right of
12 employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state or local law.
13 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal
14 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with
15 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
16 wages and interest accrued thereon. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform its
17 pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Direct
18 Hire and Staffing Agency Classes for all hours worked, including, but not limited to, all hours they
19 were subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor
20 Code and Wage Order 7.

21 26. Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under
22 conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code § 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an
23 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those
24 employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount
25 equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

26 27. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of minimum wages, Plaintiff and
27 members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes seek recovery of the balance of unpaid
28 wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to

1 Labor Code §§ 218.6, 558, 1194, 1194.2, and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil
2 Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
4 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
5 **(Against All Defendants)**

6 28. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
7 fully set forth herein.

8 29. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
9 Wage Order 7, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
10 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
11 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

12 30. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
13 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency
14 Classes, for all overtime hours worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 7. Wage
15 Order 7, § 3 requires an employer to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times
16 the employee's regular rate of pay for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused
17 Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes to work overtime hours but
18 failed to compensate these employees for all overtime hours actually worked.

19 31. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
20 members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes seek recovery of the balance of unpaid
21 overtime wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit
22 according to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure §
23 1021.5; and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
25 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 32. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
28 fully set forth herein.

1 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
2 in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including
3 Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes, with all legally compliant
4 meal periods in accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 7, § 11.

5 34. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to
6 Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes at their respective regular
7 rates of compensation, in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

8 35. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiff and
9 members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes seek recovery of unpaid premium wages
10 for meal period violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant
11 to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 7, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

12 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

14 **(Against All Defendants)**

15 36. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
16 fully set forth herein.

17 37. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 7, § 12 and establish the right of
18 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period
19 worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
20 despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and
21 Staffing Agency Classes to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did
22 not pay these individuals an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest
23 periods that they failed to authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

24 38. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
25 members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes seek recovery of unpaid premium wages
26 for rest period violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory
27 penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage
28 Order 7, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 39. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
5 fully set forth herein.

6 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
7 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff
8 and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes with accurate and complete, itemized
9 wage statements that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages
10 earned, all rates of pay and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, the
11 inclusive dates of the pay period, and/or the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the
12 employer in violation of Labor Code § 226.

13 41. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing
14 Agency Classes with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as
15 said failures led to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages and meal
16 and rest period premium wages owed and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the
17 discrepancies in Defendants' reported payroll data.

18 42. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful wage statement practices, Plaintiff and
19 members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes seek damages and/or statutory penalties,
20 reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226.

21 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

23 **(Against All Defendants)**

24 43. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
25 fully set forth herein.

26 44. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an
27 employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of separation of employment in the event the
28 employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of their

1 intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit,
2 said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last
3 date of employment.

4 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
5 to timely pay members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes all final wages due to them
6 at their separation from employment, including unpaid minimum and overtime wages as well as
7 unpaid meal and rest period premium wages.

8 46. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a
9 matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay members of the Direct
10 Hire and Staffing Agency Classes all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner
11 pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-202.

12 47. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor
13 Code § 203. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay members of the Direct Hire and Staffing
14 Agency Classes their earned wages upon separation from employment results in continued payment
15 of daily wages up to thirty days from the time the wages were due.

16 48. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, members of the Direct Hire and
17 Staffing Agency Classes seek statutory penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor
18 Code § 203.

19 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

21 **(Against All Defendants)**

22 49. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
23 fully set forth herein.

24 50. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business
25 practices in California in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by:

- 26 a. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes
27 all minimum wages due;
28 b. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes

- 1 all overtime wages due;
- 2 c. failing to provide Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency
- 3 Classes with all meal periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all
- 4 meal period premium wages due;
- 5 d. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and Staffing
- 6 Agency Classes all rest periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all
- 7 rest period premium wages due;
- 8 e. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of
- 9 the Direct Hire and Staffing Agency Classes; and
- 10 f. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Direct Hire and
- 11 Staffing Agency Classes.

12 51. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived

13 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally

14 entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over

15 Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to

16 do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

17 52. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged

18 herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of

19 monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired

20 and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

21 53. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately

22 preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

23 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

25 **(Against All Defendants)**

26 54. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though

27 fully set forth herein.

28 55. Plaintiff, an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et*

1 *seq.*, acting on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees (collectively, “Aggrieved
2 Employees”), brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due
3 to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant
4 to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial
5 violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or
6 intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each
7 employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and
8 \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3)
9 \$100 for each initial violation and \$250 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code §
10 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250 for each initial violation and \$1,000 for each
11 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to
12 Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as
13 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100 for each initial violation and
14 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor
15 Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code
16 violations:

- 17 a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Aggrieved Employees in
18 violation of Labor Code § 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- 19 b. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation
20 of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 21 c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period
22 premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in
23 violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;
- 24 d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay
25 rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of
26 compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;
- 27 e. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage
28 statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;

- f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;
- g. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204;
- h. Failing to comply with Wage Order 7, § 15's regulations on temperature in the workplace in violation of Labor Code § 1198; and
- i. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

56. On or about April 15, 2025, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") via its website, of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiff's intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code identified in the preceding paragraph. Now that 33 days and 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, Defendants have not cured any curable violations, and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

57. Plaintiff has incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiff is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;

1 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties
2 according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;

3 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof
4 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;

5 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof
6 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;

7 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
8 226;

9 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
10 203;

11 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the
12 Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or
13 practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
14 *seq.*;

15 11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other Aggrieved
16 Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and
17 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to
18 pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation
19 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the
20 amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent
21 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial
22 violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee
23 per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation
24 pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code § 256, a
25 civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as waiting time under the
26 terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each
27 subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which
28 no civil penalty is specifically provided;

1 12. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6
2 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

3 13. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§
4 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

5 14. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

6 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

7 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims.

8
9 DATED: June 16, 2025

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

10
11 By: 

12 William C. Sung

13 Tiffany L. Luu

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff NATHAN WILLIAMS
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28