

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Richard Fruin

Justin Lo (SBN: 280102)
justin@caworklawyer.com
WORK LAWYERS, PC
22939 Hawthorne Blvd., #202
Torrance, CA 90505
Phone: (424) 355-8535
Fax: (424) 355-8335

Attorneys for Plaintiff PHAT HUYNH, as representative of the State of California and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and on behalf of himself and other current and former aggrieved employees.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

PHAT HUYNH, on behalf of himself and all
other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROCKMAN CO (U.S.A) INC., a California
corporation; YIN KEUNG TIN, an individual;
PUI LUN CHAN, an individual; KENNETH
PHILLIP CHAN, an individual; DING GIA
CHAN an individual; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants,

Case No. **23STCV00921**

COMPLAINT

**1. Civil Penalties under the Private
Attorneys General Act (PAGA), Labor
Code § 2698, et seq.**

1 Plaintiff, PHAT HUYNH (“Plaintiff”), as a representative of the State of California and
2 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), and on behalf of himself and other
3 current or former aggrieved employees, complains and alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a representative action brought by Plaintiff, as a representative of the State
6 of California and the LWDA, and on behalf of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees, to collect
7 civil penalties for Defendants’ Labor Code violations.

8 2. Defendants and Employers, ROCKMAN CO (U.S.A) Inc., YIN KEUNG TIN,
9 PUI LUN CHAN, KENNETH PHILLIP CHAN, and DING GIA CHAN (collectively
10 “Defendants”) violated numerous wage and hour laws with respect to Plaintiff and other
11 aggrieved employees by failing to provide, for example: accurate and itemized wages statements,
12 payment for all hours worked (including regular wages and overtime), failure to provide a
13 minimum wage lawful meal periods, lawful rest periods, timely payment during employment,
14 failure to reimburse for expenses incurred during the course and scope of employment, and
15 payment upon separation of employment.

16 **PARTIES**

17 **The Plaintiff**

18 3. Plaintiff PHAT HUYNH (“Plaintiff” or “HUYNH”) is, and at all times mentioned
19 herein, was a resident of the County of Los Angeles in the State of California.

20 4. Similarly aggrieved, former and/or current non-exempt employees employed by
21 Defendants during the relevant time period who were subject to the same wage and hour policies
22 and practices as Plaintiff, and thereby, suffered similar or substantially similar violations
23 (hereinafter “Aggrieved Employees”).

24 **The Defendants**

25 5. Defendant ROCKMAN CO (U.S.A) INC is a California corporation which, at all
26 relevant times mentioned herein, existing, doing business and employing individuals in the
27 County of Los Angeles, State of California.

1 6. Defendant YIN KEUNG TIN (“TIN”) is an individual over the age of 18 years,
2 and based on information and belief, was residing at all times mentioned herein in the County of
3 Alameda State of California.

4 7. Defendant PUI LUN CHAN (“LUN CHAN”) is an individual over the age of 18
5 years, and based on information and belief, was residing at all times mentioned herein in the
6 County of Los Angeles, State of California.

7 8. Defendant KENNETH PHILLIP CHAN (“PHILLIP CHAN”) is an individual
8 over the age of 18 years, and based on information and belief, was residing at all times mentioned
9 herein in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

10 9. Defendant DING GIA CHAN (“GIA CHAN”) is an individual over the age of 18
11 years, and based on information and belief, was residing at all times mentioned herein in the
12 County of Los Angeles, State of California.

13 10. Plaintiff is informed and thereon alleges that Defendants exercised control over
14 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees’ wages, hours, and working conditions.

15 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
16 herein, Defendants, and each of them, exercised control over Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees’
17 wages, hours, or working conditions.

18 12. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
19 otherwise of Defendants named herein as DOES 1-50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff at this
20 time and therefore said Defendants are sued by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to
21 amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of said Defendants when the same
22 become known to Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that each of
23 the fictitiously-named Defendants are responsible for the wrongful acts alleged herein and are
24 therefore liable to Plaintiff as alleged hereinafter.

25 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants, and each
26 of them, including those Defendants named DOES 1-50, acted in concert with one another to
27 commit the wrongful acts alleged therein, and aided, abetted, incited, compelled, and/or coerced
28

one another in the wrongful acts alleged herein, and/or attempted to do so. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the Defendants, and each of them, including those Defendants named as DOES 1-50, formed and executed a conspiracy or common plan pursuant to which they would commit the unlawful acts alleged herein, with all such acts alleged herein done as part of and pursuant to said conspiracy, intended to and actually causing Plaintiff harm.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County, because Defendants maintains its locations and transacts business in this county, the obligations and liability primarily arise in this county, and work was primarily performed by Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees in this county.

15. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this matter. The individual claims are under the seventy-five thousand dollar (\$75,000.00) jurisdictional threshold for federal court and PAGA penalties cannot be aggregated to meet the minimum jurisdictional amount required for diversity removal. Further, there is no federal question at issue as the issues herein are based solely on California statutes and law, including, but not limited to, the California Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, California Code of Civil Procedure, and California Rules of Court.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

16. Defendants, a manufacturing company, employed Plaintiff and aggrieved employees, in non-exempt positions, in California during the relevant PAGA period. Plaintiff began working or on about 1995 to the present as a non-exempt "Forklift Driver".

17. The position required Plaintiff to work more than 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours per week without lawful compensation. Plaintiff and nonexempt aggrieved employees were regularly not paid for minimum wages and overtime for compensable work time spent under the control of Defendants, but which was performed off-the-clock, even though such additional work time was in excess of regularly scheduled, eight-hour daily shifts.

1 18. Plaintiff and nonexempt aggrieved employees were subject to not having all their
2 compensable work time recorded. Not all of Plaintiff and nonexempt aggrieved employees'
3 compensable work time spent under the control of Defendants was accounted for and
4 compensated. Specifically, Defendants (1) adjusted clock in and clock out times to the
5 disadvantage of Plaintiff and other non-exempt aggrieved employees by rounding up clock-in
6 times when Plaintiff and non-exempt employees clocked in before the scheduled start of their
7 respective shifts and rounded down clock-out times when Plaintiff and nonexempt aggrieved
8 employees worked past the scheduled end time for their shifts, as well as (2) requiring Plaintiff
9 and non-exempt employees to continue working when ostensibly on duty-free meal periods, or
10 requiring them to return to work before the end of their thirty-minute meal periods but prohibiting
11 them from clocking back in until the legally required thirty-minute mark.

12 19. Based on information and belief, Plaintiff believes non-exempt employees were
13 also not being fully reimbursed for all necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their
14 job duties. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff and aggrieved employees, regardless of
15 classification, to use their personal cellular telephones to send and receive messages and calls
16 with supervisors to understand their duties and the scope of work. Defendants failed to reimburse
17 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees fully for use of their personal cellular devices, for
18 consumption of personal calling or data plans to perform their work duties.

19 20. Defendants failed to authorize and permit all required meal and rest periods for
20 Plaintiff and nonexempt aggrieved employees because, upon information and belief, Defendants
21 maintained unlawful meal/rest period policies and practices. In order to curtail labor costs,
22 Defendants regularly did not staff enough employees to provide sufficient coverage to maintain
23 their business operations so Plaintiff and aggrieved employees could not both complete their
24 assigned daily duties and take complete, timely and uninterrupted meal and rest breaks.
25 Defendants prioritized completion of daily duties ahead of meal and rest period compliance.
26 Furthermore, Defendants nevertheless deducted a half hour from the daily time worked by
27 Plaintiff and aggrieved employers for ostensible meal periods despite the fact such breaks not
28

1 actually taken or delayed or interrupted. Moreover, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and
2 aggrieved employees with an additional hour of premium pay at the regular rate of pay for each
3 meal/rest period violation, as required by Labor Code section 226.7.

4 21. As a result of the violations described above, Plaintiff and nonexempt aggrieved
5 employees experienced collateral or derivative violations. Specifically, Defendants failed to
6 provide Plaintiff and nonexempt Aggrieved Employees accurate itemized wage statements in
7 writing in compliance with Labor Code section 226 and failed to compensate Plaintiff and other
8 former nonexempt aggrieved employees for all wages owed at the time employment with
9 Defendants had ended.

10 22. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), any provision of the Labor
11 Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its
12 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for violation of the code
13 may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on
14 behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures
15 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

16 23. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
17 specifically provided, Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f) imposes upon Defendants a
18 penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the
19 initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period
20 for each subsequent pay period in which Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

21 24. Defendants' conduct during the PAGA period with respect to Plaintiff and the
22 Aggrieved Employees violates numerous Labor Code sections as detailed herein.

23 25. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants has engaged in a systematic pattern of wage and
24 hour violations under the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

25 26. At all relevant times herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other aggrieved
26 employees as employees who were subject to the employment policies, in whole or in part, and
27 therefore suffered the same or substantially similar violations, in whole or in part.
28

1 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive
3 wages for all hours worked, including the applicable minimum, regular, and overtime wages,
4 and that they were not receiving all wages earned for work that was required to be performed. In
5 violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
6 aggrieved employees for all hours worked. Accordingly, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
7 aggrieved employees all earned minimum, regular, and/or overtime compensation.

8 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
9 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive all
10 required meal periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and aggrieved
11 employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted off-duty meal
12 period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendants had a pattern, practice,
13 and policy of not providing timely meal periods. Defendants failed to pay an additional hour of
14 pay to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for late meal periods. As a result of Defendants'
15 unlawful policy and practice, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees did not receive all meal periods
16 or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and aggrieved employees' regular rate
17 of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted 30 minute off-duty meal period.

18 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
19 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive all
20 required rest periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and aggrieved
21 employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted off-duty rest
22 period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendants had a pattern, practice,
23 and policy of not providing timely rest periods. Defendants failed to pay an additional hour of
24 pay to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for each rest periods were not provided or was
25 interrupted. As a result of Defendants' unlawful policy and practice, Plaintiff and aggrieved
26 employees did not receive all required rest periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay
27 at Plaintiff's and aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely,
28

1 uninterrupted 10 minute off-duty rest period.

2 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
3 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and certain aggrieved employees were entitled to
4 timely payment of wages due upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code,
5 Plaintiff and certain aggrieved employees did not receive payment of all wages due, within
6 permissible time periods, upon separation of employment.

7 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
8 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive
9 itemized wage statements that accurately showed their actual hours worked, total hours worked,
10 number of hours worked at each hourly rate, gross and net wages earned, and correct employer
11 information in accordance with California law. As a result of the wage violations specified
12 above, and in violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were not provided
13 with accurate itemized wage statements that accurately reported their gross and net wages
14 earned, total hours worked, each applicable rate of pay in effect during the pay period with the
15 corresponding number of hours worked, and the address of the legal entity that is the employer,
16 among other things.

17
18 32. Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were employees covered under one or more
19 statutes under the Labor Code, including but not limited to section 2802, but were not reimbursed
20 by Defendants for all business expenses incurred, including but not limited to expenses arising
21 from use of personal cellular devices for work purposes, buying special tools to complete their
22 work assignments and the prorated cost of personal cellular plans utilized for work purposes.

23 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
24 should have known that Defendants were required to maintain accurate records of the hours
25 worked by Plaintiff and aggrieved employees. In violation of the Labor Code, Defendants failed
26 to maintain accurate records of hours worked by Plaintiff and aggrieved employees due to its
27 off-the-clock and/or unfair rounding practices, among other things.
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

4
5

6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3

5
6
7
8

9
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27
28

39. California Labor Code §§2698-2699.5, in relevant part provides, “any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency...for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

40. As an aggrieved employee, Plaintiff brings this civil action to recover civil penalties for Defendant's Labor Code violations.

First Violation

(Failure to Provide Meal Periods, in Violation of Labor Code Section 512)

41. Under California Labor Code §512(a), “An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.”

42. Defendants violated Labor Code § 512 by failing to provide Plaintiff, and other qualifying employees who worked shifts of greater than five hours, meal periods within the first five hours of the shifts worked. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff one hour's pay at Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for each day Defendants failed to provide a meal period in compliance with section 512.

Second Violation

(Failure to Provide Rest Periods, in Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7)

43. Under California Labor Code §226.7(b), “An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission”

44. Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) provides, “Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle

1 of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked
2 daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof.”

3 45. Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other employee to take
4 rest periods and mandated by the Wage Order.

5 46. Under §226.7(c), an employer who violates §226.7(b), “...shall pay the employee
6 one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that
7 the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.”

8 47. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other employees who were not provided
9 rest periods one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay.

10 **Third Violation**

11 **(Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements,**
12 **in Violation of Labor Code Section 226)**

13 48. Under California Labor Code §226(a), an employer is legally obligated to provide
14 its employees, semi-monthly or at the time of payment of wages, “an accurate itemized statement
15 in writing...”

16 49. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
17 for Defendants’ Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney’s fees and costs, under
18 Labor Code § 2699.

19 **Fourth Violation**

20 **(Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

21 50. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and IWC Wage Orders, an
22 employer is required to compensate employees for all overtime, which is calculated at one and
23 one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per
24 day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and for the first eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive
25 workday, with double time for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday
26 and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in
27 any workweek.
28

1 51. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
2 for Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
3 Labor Code § 2699.

4 **Fifth Violation**

5 **(Failure to Pay Minimum Wages)**

6 52. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and IWC Wage Orders,
7 payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a
8 payroll period is unlawful.

9 53. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
10 for Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
11 Labor Code § 2699.

12 **Sixth Violation**

13 **(Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment)**

14 54. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 204, for all labor performed between the 1st
15 and 15th days of any calendar month, an employer is required to pay its employees between the
16 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed. California Labor Code §
17 204 also provides that for all labor performed between the 16th and 26th days of any calendar
18 month, Defendants was required to pay their employees between the 1st and 15th day of the
19 following calendar month. In addition, California Labor Code § 204 provides that all wages
20 earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday of the
21 next regular payroll period.

22 55. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
23 for Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
24 Labor Code § 2699.

25 **Seventh Violation**

26 **(Failure to Pay All Wages Due to Discharged and Quitting Employees)**

27 56. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 201, 202, and 203, Defendants is required to
28

1 pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code §
2 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and
3 unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.

4 57. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
5 for Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
6 Labor Code § 2699.

7
8 **Eighth Violation**

9 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses in Violation of Labor Code § 2802**

10 **(Against all Defendants and DOES 1 to 50, inclusive)**

11 58. Labor Code § 2802 provides that an employer shall indemnify his or her
12 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
13 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
14 the employer.

15 59. Defendants failed to indemnify and reimburse Plaintiff for all necessary
16 expenditures or losses incurred by Plaintiff in direct consequence of the discharge of Plaintiff's
17 job duties.

18 60. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2802, Plaintiff is entitled to recover business expenses
19 incurred as a result of discharging his duties, including interest.

20 61. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
21 for Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
22 Labor Code § 2699.

23
24 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

25 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 26 1. For penalties in an amount according to proof;
27 2. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to the PAGA; and
28 3. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

1 Dated: January 16, 2023

2 **WORK LAWYERS, PC**

3
4 By:  _____
5 Justin Lo, Esq.
6 Attorney for Plaintiff PHAT HUYNH and
7 Aggrieved Employees
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A



NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS - PAGA
(Labor Code § 2699.3)

DATE October 24, 2022

DELIVERY Online Filing and Certified U.S. Mail

RECIPIENTS California
Workforce Development Agency
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Phat Huynh v. Rockman CO (U.S.A) Inc., ET AL —NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS UNDER CAL. LABOR CODE §2699.3

Dear Representative:

This office represents Phat Huynh (“Mr. Huynh”) with respect to his claims against Rockman CO (U.S.A) Inc and Yin Keung Tin, Pui Lun Chan, Kenneth Phillip Chan and Ding Gia Chan (“Employers”) for violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders. This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail. Employers are a corporation doing business in the State of California. Employers employed Mr. Huynh from approximately August 1995, until the present, as a non-exempt employee. During his employment with Employers, Mr. Huynh was employed as a “Forklift Driver” at Employers’ warehouse located at 1200, Smith Avenue, Santa Fe Spring, CA 90670.

Mr. Huynh intends to seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under California Labor Code section 2698, et seq., the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”). Mr. Huynh is seeking penalties on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt employees of any of the Employers (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Mr. Huynh employment, including but not limited to violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“IWC Wage Order”) including



inter alia, IWC Wage Order No. 5. The claims made on behalf of Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION.

Employers have engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

First, Employers regularly required Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock in order to complete their duties and responsibilities. This off-the-clock work included, amongst other things, requiring Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees to: (1) respond to Employers and work-related requests and perform work while clocked out for purported meal breaks; (2) perform work before clocking in for the start of their shift; and (3) perform work after clocking out for the end of their shift. Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for this off-the-clock work, resulting in a failure to pay minimum wages and straight time wages. Moreover, this off-the-clock work typically caused Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours in a day and forty (40) hours in week, resulting in a failure to pay overtime compensation.

In addition to requiring Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock without compensation, Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees, which resulted in a failure to pay Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages. Finally, and as a matter of policy and/or practice, Employers failed to pay overtime to Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers have failed to pay Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS



Employers failed to provide Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Employers required Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. On the occasions that Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees did take a meal period, their meal periods were frequently interrupted or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods, which included responding to in-person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 226.7(a), 512(a) and 1198.

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS AND PAY REST PERIOD PREMIUMS.



Employers failed to authorize and permit Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees take legally compliant 10-minute periods. Employers required Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees were never completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods, which included responding to in person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the rest periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 226.7(a), and 1198.

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT.



As to each pay period, Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned because Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, inter alia, overtime compensation, straight time wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE TO DISCHARGED AND QUTTING EMPLOYEES.

As to each pay period, Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned because Mr. Huynh Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, inter alia, overtime compensation, straight time wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 201(a), 202(a) and 203(a).

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees never included the actual hours worked the time worked was rounded, the name and address of the legal employing entity, and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS.

Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES.



California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. IWC Wage Order No. 5 requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO PAY VACATION TIME.

Pursuant to California Labor Code section 227.3, “. . . whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served.” During the relevant time period, Employers failed to pay Mr. Huynh and other Aggrieved Employees for all earned and unused and accrued vacation time at their final rate of pay at the time of termination of their employment. Accordingly, Employers have violated California Labor Code section 227.3.

Mr. Huynh and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; California Labor Code section 227 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

Sincerely,


JUSTIN LO ESQ.



Notice via Certified Mail

Yin Keung Tin
Agent for Service of Process
Rockman CO (U.S.A) Inc
12011 Smith Ave
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

Rockman CO (U.S.A) Inc
Human Resources/Legal Dept.
12011 Smith Ave
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

Yin Keung Tin (an individual)
12011 Smith Ave
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

Pui Lun Chan
12011 Smith Ave
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

Kenneth Phillip Chan (an
individual) 12011 Smith Ave
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

Ding Gia Chan (an individual)
12011 Smith Ave
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670