

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
jyslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Jeffrey C. Bils (SBN 301629)
jbils@wilshirelawfirm.com
Aram Boyadjian (SBN 334009)
aboyadjian@wilshirelawfirm.com
Andrew Sandoval (SBN 346996)
andrew.sandoval@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

JESSICA BRONSAL, individually, on behalf of
all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the
State of California and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiff,

v.

PTI TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,


Defendants.

Case No.: 56-2022-00570361-CU-OE-VTA

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

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
5. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226);
7. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and
8. Civil Penalties Under PAGA (Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, *et seq.*).

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL



1 Plaintiff Jessica Bronsal (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary support
2 or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation
3 and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant PTI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and
6 DOES 1 through 10 (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor
7 Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay for all
8 hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods,
9 failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay final wages, and failure to furnish
10 accurate wage statements.

11 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Seven Causes of Action individually and as a class
12 action on behalf of herself and certain current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter
13 collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” and defined more fully below). The
14 Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any Defendant(s) in
15 California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations period
16 applicable to the claims pleaded here.

17 3. Plaintiff Jessica Bronsal brings the Eighth Cause of Action as a representative action
18 under the California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are
19 owed to Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt employees employed
20 by Defendants in the State of California during the statute of limitations period for their PAGA
21 claim (hereinafter referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

22 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
23 establishment within the State of California, including Ventura County. As such, and based upon
24 all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are
25 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
26 (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

27 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained
28 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum, straight time, and overtime in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.
- (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation occurred.
- (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred.
- (d) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages due within the time period specified by California law when employment terminates; and,
- (e) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior."

THE PARTIES

1 **A. Plaintiff**

2 8. Plaintiff Jessica Bronsal is a resident of Ventura County, California who worked for
3 Defendants in Ventura County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from
4 approximately July 2021 to approximately October 2021.

5 9. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new
6 Plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v.*
7 *American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

8 **B. Defendants**

9 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
10 alleges, that Defendant PTI Technologies, Inc. is and at all times herein mentioned, was:

- 11 (a) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
12 State of California, including Ventura County; and,
13 (b) A former employer of Plaintiff, and a current and/or former employer of the
14 putative Class because Defendants PTI Technologies, Inc. suffered and
15 permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or
16 controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

17 11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued
18 herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each
19 of the Doe Defendants were in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by
20 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this
21 complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been
22 ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

23 12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
24 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
25 injured a significant number of the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the State
26 of California.

27 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each
28 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the

1 other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over her wages,
2 hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all
3 relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director,
4 controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or
5 predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all
6 of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some
7 or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged
8 below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant
9 to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should
10 have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the
11 conduct of all other Defendants and/or all Defendants were joint employers.

12 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

13 14. Plaintiff Jessica Bronsal worked for Defendants in Ventura County, California as
14 an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately July 2021 to approximately October
15 2021. During Plaintiff's employment for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiff an hourly wage
16 and classified her as non-exempt from overtime. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiff to work
17 at least four days in a workweek and at least ten hours per day, but Plaintiff also worked more than
18 ten hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

19 15. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked
20 (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with legally
21 compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods, failed to pay
22 all wages twice per month to Plaintiff, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when
23 Defendants terminated her employment, and failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff.
24 As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

25 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
26 paying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including
27 minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiff, the Class, and the
28 Aggrieved Employees to work "off-the-clock," uncompensated, by, for example, requiring

Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work during uncompensated meal periods and rest periods. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. Additionally, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages for all hours worked due to Defendants' payroll policies and practices that unfairly rounded employees' wages to the detriment of the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees. This rounding policy routinely failed to capture the entirety of the hours the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees worked and was structured in a way that in favored underpayment. Defendants could and did track the exact time in minutes that employees worked yet failed to pay for all time worked. (*Camp v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638.) This uncompensated time violated California's requirement that employees be compensated for all hours worked. In failing to pay for all hours worked (including failing to pay at the correct regular rate of pay, and including detrimental rounding), Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period in a manner required by law (and also including but not limited to failing to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to leave the work premises to take meal periods). Defendants also continued to assert control over Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees by, among other things, requiring, pressuring, or encouraging her to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period under the conditions required by law, and without properly compensating Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided as required by law (including failing to pay at the correct regular rate of pay). Defendants also never informed Plaintiff of her right to, nor permitted her to take, a second meal period when Plaintiff worked at least ten hours of work in a workday and otherwise unlawfully pressured her to waive such breaks. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

1 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
2 and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods
3 (and also including but not limited to failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the
4 Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to leave the work premises to take rest periods). Defendants
5 regularly required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four
6 consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting her to take a 10-minute,
7 uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours),
8 or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that
9 were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff,
10 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging her to perform
11 work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods,
12 or by denying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period.
13 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice were to not authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class,
14 and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

15 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
16 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all final wages due at their termination of
17 employment. In addition, Plaintiff's final paychecks did not include payment for all expenditures,
18 minimum wages, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
19 period premium wages owed to her by Defendants at the conclusion of her employment. On
20 information and belief, Defendants' failure to timely pay Plaintiff's final wages when her
21 employment terminated was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead consistent with
22 Defendants' policy and practice that applied to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

23 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff, the Class,
24 and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable
25 hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages
26 for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for
27 rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law). As
28

1 a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff, the Class, and the
2 Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 3 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
4 minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period
5 premium wages, even though they were entitled;
- 6 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
7 straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium
8 wages, even though they had not been;
- 9 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
10 straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium
11 wages at the correct California rate even though they were entitled;
- 12 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, straight time,
13 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the
14 correct California rate even though they had not been;
- 15 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
16 straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium
17 wages owed to them;
- 18 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
19 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
20 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
21 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
22 statements contained the required accurate information;
- 23 (g) by understating the wages truly due to them, the violations caused them to
24 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,
25 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- 26 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wage
27 rates to which Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were
28

entitled, and Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e) and injunctive relief under California Labor Code § 226(h).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

21. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

22. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

23. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years and 178 days before the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class is sent.¹

24. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

25. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

26. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is readily ascertainable:

(a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be greater than forty (40) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.

(b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect

¹ In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California adopted Emergency Rule 9(a) (California Rules of Court), whereby "statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 to October 1, 2020."

the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

(c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

(d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and,
- 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might

1 damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other
2 means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the
3 complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their
4 rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

5 27. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if
6 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without
7 limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- 8 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum,
9 straight time, and overtime wages;
- 10 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class
11 Members;
- 12 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
13 wages to Class Members;
- 14 (d) Failed to provide Class Members with timely final wages;
- 15 (e) Failed to provide Class Members with accurate wage statements; and,
- 16 (f) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a
17 result of their illegal conduct as described above.

18 28. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
19 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- 20 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
21 question affecting only individual members;
- 22 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
23 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 24 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
25 members of the class before the Court;
- 26 (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
27 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
28 class action;

- (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of:
- 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or,
 - 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the class as a whole.

29. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff contemplates the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages

for All Hours Worked)

30. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 29 in this Complaint.

31. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

32. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 1194, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

33. Accordingly, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover minimum and straight time wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

34. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

35. By virtue of the Defendants’ unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

36. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code § 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage compensation due Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

37. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages.

38. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all

1 wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to
2 this cause of action, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid
3 twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum and straight time wages. However,
4 during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and
5 the Aggrieved Employees all such wages due and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

6 39. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to seek recovery
7 of all unpaid minimum and straight time wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs
8 pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

9 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

11 40. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
12 1 through 29 in this Complaint.

13 41. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
14 employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they
15 receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.
16 California Labor Code § 511 provides other specific requirements if applicable and if conditions
17 are met (which they were not).

18 42. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall
19 not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional
20 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
21 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed
22 by the IWC is unlawful.

23 43. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have
24 worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as
25 employees of Defendants.

26 44. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the
27 Aggrieved Employees overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the
28 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code §§ 510, 511 and 1198.

48. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class with, and the Aggrieved Employees all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

(Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)

50. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of Plaintiff's, the Class's, and the Aggrieved Employees' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. California Labor Code § 512, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for

each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

51. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

52. Under California law, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)

53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 29 in this Complaint.

54. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). California Labor Code § 512, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten minutes each for each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage Order.

55. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than four hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made

1 it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully
2 violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

3 56. Under California law, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled
4 to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all
5 required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

6 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **(Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees –**
8 **Waiting Time Penalties)**

9 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
10 1 through 29 in this Complaint.

11 58. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
12 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due
13 and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or
14 her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless
15 the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
16 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

17 59. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of many other members
18 of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will
19 be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail to pay
20 terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California Labor
21 Code §§ 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their
22 leaving Defendants' employ.

23 60. Defendants' failure to pay those Class members who are no longer employed by
24 Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72)
25 hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and
26 202.

27 61. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
28 wages owed, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as

1 a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced;
2 but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

3 62. The Class is entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages
4 for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum
5 pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

6 63. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, the Class is also
7 entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this
8 action.

9 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and**
11 **Compliant Wage Records)**

12 64. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
13 1 through 29 in this Complaint.

14 65. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
15 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in
16 writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
17 worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate
18 if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made
19 on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned,
20 (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee
21 and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number
22 other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the
23 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
24 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

25 66. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
26 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure
27 to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees,
28 the failure to list the true "total hours worked by the employee," and the failure to list the true net

1 wages earned.

2 67. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff,
3 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily
4 protected rights.

5 68. Specifically, Plaintiff, the members of the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have
6 been injured by Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they
7 were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate,
8 itemized wage statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

9 69. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
10 Employees is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff, the Class,
11 and the Aggrieved Employees were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt
12 to obtain correct wage information following Defendants’ refusal to comply with many of the
13 mandates of California’s Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

14 70. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from
15 Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with
16 California Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars
17 (\$4,000) per employee.

18 71. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to injunctive
19 relief, as well as an award of attorney’s fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section,
20 pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h).

21 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **(Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code**
23 **§§ 17200, et seq.)**

24 72. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
25 1 through 29 in this Complaint.

26 73. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under California Business
27 & Professions Code § 17201.

28 74. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,

1 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, the Aggrieved Employees, and to the
2 general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the
3 meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

4 75. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and
5 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
6 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

7 76. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
8 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations
9 of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy;
10 and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby
11 constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business
12 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

13 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages**

14 77. Defendants' failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, and other benefits in
15 violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by
16 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

17 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

18 78. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation
19 of California Labor Code §§ 510, 511, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
20 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

21 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

22 79. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
23 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or
24 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

25 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

26 80. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
27 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
28 and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

1 81. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
2 herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiff, and
3 all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of
4 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

5 82. Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered monetary
6 injury as a direct result of Defendants’ wrongful conduct.

7 83. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, and the
8 Aggrieved Employees, is entitled to, and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge
9 money and/or property which the Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff, the
10 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have been deprived, by means of the above-described unfair,
11 unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
12 are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of Defendants in
13 order to recover restitution.

14 84. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, and the
15 Aggrieved Employees, is further entitled to and does seek a declaration that the above-described
16 business practices are unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the
17 Defendants, and each of them, from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or
18 fraudulent business practices in the future.

19 85. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, and the
20 Aggrieved Employees, has no plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries
21 which the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees, suffered as a consequence of the
22 Defendants’ unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of the unfair,
23 unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually, and on
24 behalf of members of the putative Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, has suffered and will
25 continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from
26 continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

27 86. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
28 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other

1 withholdings.

2 87. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff,
3 putative Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages
4 withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years and 178 days prior
5 to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding
6 wages due to Plaintiff, Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees; an award of attorneys' fees
7 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award
8 of costs.

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(By Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys**
11 **General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698, et seq.)**

12 88. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
13 1 through 29 in this Complaint.

14 89. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
15 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

16 90. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
17 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law,
18 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
19 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
20 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
21 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
22 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

23 91. Plaintiff Jessica Bronsal gave written notice by online filing pursuant to California
24 Labor Code § 2699.3 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to
25 Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against
26 Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support
27 the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee. Plaintiff's PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-
28

1 909404-22 (JESSICA BRONSAL v. PTI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and ESCO TECHNOLOGIES,
2 LLC).

3 92. The Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to
4 investigate Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Plaintiff hereby commences
5 a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations
6 of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to,
7 penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

8 93. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of
9 civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and similarly situated Aggrieved
10 Employees of Defendant. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is an amount to be
11 shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted
12 by law.

13 94. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant
14 to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action
15 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

17 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the
18 class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

19 **Class Certification**

- 20 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third,
21 Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;
22 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and,
23 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

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

- 25 4. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
26 Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
27 minimum and straight time wages due;
28 5. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

7. For liquidated damages;

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 510, 511 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due;

11. For unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Third Cause of Action

15. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

20. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;
22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,
24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;
26. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;
27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;
28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,
29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;
31. For all actual damages, according to proof;
32. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);
33. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);
34. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,
35. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California

1 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum,
2 straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, and failing to authorize and
3 permit rest periods;

4 37. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment
5 interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

6 38. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds
7 disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a
8 result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

9 39. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
10 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

11 40. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
12 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

13 41. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

14 As to the Eight Cause of Action

15 42. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the California
16 Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and
17 overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods and pay the correct amount of meal period
18 premium wages, failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay the correct amount of rest
19 period premium wages, failing to pay all earned wages twice per month, failing to maintain
20 accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failing to pay all final wages to terminated
21 employees, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

22 43. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

23 44. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*, and all
24 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

25 45. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
26 Labor Code § 2699; and,

27 46. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
28 appropriate.

As to all Causes of Action


47. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 16, 2023

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

By: _____


John G. Yslas
Jeffrey C. Bils
Aram Boyadjian
Andrew Sandoval
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

Dated: August 16, 2023

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

By: _____


John G. Yslas
Jeffrey C. Bils
Aram Boyadjian
Andrew Sandoval
Attorneys for Plaintiff

PROOF OF SERVICE

Jessica Bronsal v. PTI Technologies, Inc., et al.
Case No. 56-2022-00570361-CU-OE-VTA

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, Matthew Krout, state that I am employed in the aforesaid County, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010. My electronic service address is mkrou@wilshirelawfirm.com.

On **August 16, 2023**, I served the foregoing:

FIRST AMENDED CLASS & REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT


on the interested parties listed below by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope by following one of the methods of service as follows:

Karl N. Haws, Esq.
khaws@mohlaw.com
Jim C. Moore, Esq.
jmoore@mohlaw.com
MUNDELL, ODLUM & HAWS, LLP
650 East Hospitality Lane, Suite 470
San Bernardino, CA 92408-3595
Defendants for PTI Technologies, Inc.

- () **BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY:** I am “readily familiar” with this firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for overnight delivery. Under that practice, overnight packages are enclosed in a sealed envelope with a packing slip attached thereto fully prepaid. The packages are picked up by the carrier at our offices or delivered by our office to a designated collection site.
- (X) **BY MAIL:** I enclosed the above documents in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid and placed for collection and mailing on the above date in accordance with ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this firm’s practice of collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and that the correspondence shall be deposited with the United States Postal Service the same day in the ordinary course of business pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a).
- (X) **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known email address or e-mail of record in this action.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **August 16, 2023**, at Los Angeles, California.



Matthew Krout