

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Theresa Traber

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff JUDDY SAENZ, on behalf of herself and other aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JUDDY SAENZ, on behalf of herself
and other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

EUROSTAR, INC., a Delaware
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 22STCV39723

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT ("PAGA") [California
Labor Code §§2698, et seq.]**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff JUDDY SAENZ ("Saenz"), on behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees (hereinafter collectively "Plaintiffs"), and as private attorneys general, hereby assert representative claims against Defendant EUROSTAR, INC. ("Eurostar"), and DOES 1 through 100 (hereinafter collectively "Defendants"), and hereby complain and allege as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This lawsuit is directed at Defendants' California state law violations of wage and hour laws -- it is a representative action seeking recovery of civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), California Labor Code ("Labor Code") §§2698, et seq. PAGA permits "aggrieved employees" to bring a lawsuit as a representative action on behalf of themselves and other aggrieved current and former employees to recover civil penalties

1 for Defendant's violations of the Labor Code, including, but not limited to Labor Code §§201,
2 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 2699, and 2802, and all applicable Industrial
3 Welfare Commission ("IWC") Orders.

4 2. This action is brought as a representative action on behalf of all current and
5 former aggrieved employees who were employed by Defendants in California and who work or
6 worked as non-exempt hourly employees during the applicable time period and who were subject
7 to Defendants' meal period policy, rest period policy, compensation policy, overtime policy,
8 final payment of wages policy, and related wage and hour policies and/or practices.

9 3. As set forth in detail below, Defendants consistently implemented, maintained
10 and enforced unlawful policies and practices regarding Plaintiffs in violation of California's
11 wage and hour laws, which led to Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7,
12 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 2698, et seq. and IWC Wage Orders to Defendants': (1) failure to pay all
13 wages, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation; (2) failure
14 to provide meal periods; (3) failure to authorize and permit rest periods or provide compensation
15 in lieu thereof; (4) failure to timely pay all wages owed; (5) failure to properly maintain and
16 submit accurate itemized wage statements; (6) failure to reimburse expenses; and (7) waiting
17 time penalties. Such policies and practices, and illegal agreements, as described herein, violate
18 the Labor Code, and trigger civil penalties under Labor Code §2699. Therefore, Plaintiffs, on
19 behalf of themselves and all aggrieved employees, bring this representative PAGA action
20 pursuant to the provisions of the Labor Code as referenced herein. Plaintiffs seek recovery of
21 civil penalties, reasonable attorney's fees and costs, and other relief as deemed proper.

22 4. The acts complained of herein occurred, occur and will occur, at least in part,
23 within the statute of limitations under the PAGA statute, or within the statute of limitations of
24 any other Complaint or other filing which has tolled the claims asserted herein, up to and through
25 the time of trial for this matter.

26 **II. THE PARTIES**

27 5. Plaintiff Saenz is, and was at all relevant times mentioned herein, an individual
28 residing within the State of California. Plaintiff Saenz worked for Defendants as a non-exempt

1 employee until August 2022, when she was terminated.

2 6. Defendant Eurostar is and has been, at all relevant times herein, a corporation
3 organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, and doing business within the
4 County of Los Angeles, in the State of California.

5 7. Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious
6 names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to Plaintiffs. When their true names and
7 capacities are ascertained, Plaintiffs will amend their complaint by inserting their true names and
8 capacities herein. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that each of the
9 fictitiously named Defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged
10 and that Plaintiffs' damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by those Defendants.

11 8. Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned in this
12 Complaint were the agents, servants and/or employees of some or all other Defendants, and vice-
13 versa, and in doing the things alleged in this Complaint, Defendants are now and/or at all times
14 mentioned in this Complaint were acting within the course and scope of that agency, servitude
15 and/or employment.

16 9. Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned in this
17 Complaint were members of and/or engaged in a joint venture, partnership and common
18 enterprise, and were acting within the course and scope of, and in pursuit of a joint venture,
19 partnership and common enterprise.

20 10. Each reference in this complaint to "Defendant," "Defendants," or a specifically
21 named Defendant refers also to all Defendants sued under fictitious names.

22 11. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege that at all relevant times
23 herein, Defendants maintained offices, employed persons, conducted business in, and/or engaged
24 in illegal employment practices and policies in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

25 26 **III. JURISDICTION**

27 12. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction in this matter due to Defendants'
28 aforementioned violations of California statutory law and/or related common law principles.

1 13. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because both the
2 relief sought herein exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be
3 established at trial, according to proof.

4 14. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because
5 Defendants' corporate officers direct, control, and coordinate Defendants' activities from
6 Defendants' offices located in the State of California.

7 15. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because during
8 their employment with Defendants, Plaintiffs herein were all California citizens and Defendants
9 have owned and operated offices within California. Further, there is no federal question at issue,
10 as the issues herein are based solely on California statutes and law.

11 **IV. VENUE**

12 16. Venue in Los Angeles County is proper in this matter as Defendants' liabilities
13 and obligations arose in Los Angeles County, including Defendants' statutory obligations to pay
14 Plaintiffs wages for all hours worked, overtime wages, straight time wages, minimum wages,
15 timely wages upon termination and/or resignation, provide legally compliant meal and rest
16 periods, maintain and submit accurate wage statements, and other obligations as described
17 herein.

18 **V. COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

19 17. Defendants own and operate retail shoe stores throughout California and
20 elsewhere. This case arises out of Defendants' failure to comply with California's wage and
21 hour laws.

22 18. Plaintiffs and the aggrieved employees who Plaintiffs seek to represent worked
23 for Defendants as non-exempt employees in California, during the relevant time period.

24 19. During Plaintiffs' employment, Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiffs and other
25 aggrieved employees the proper amount of straight time and overtime wages. Defendants have
26 violated various sections of the Labor Code, including §§510 and 1194, by failing to provide
27 Plaintiffs overtime compensation for work over 8 hours in a day and/or 40 hours in a week,
28 because, among other things, Plaintiffs work off-the-clock in opening and closing stores, and

1 respond to text messages from their superiors when they are not on-the-clock.

2 20. Defendants also fail to provide Plaintiffs with meal and rest periods under
3 California law. Defendants failed to adopt, implement, and enforce a uniform meal period policy
4 that complied with California law. For example, Defendants required Plaintiffs to take meal
5 periods after they worked for more than five hours, and Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs
6 with their full 30 minute duty-free meal period based on numerous factors, including but not
7 limited to the fact that the amount of work required of Plaintiffs by Defendants, as well as the
8 severe understaffing of stores, necessitated that Plaintiffs take their meal periods late, return
9 early from their meal periods, and/or interrupt their meal periods. Moreover, as a matter of
10 policy and/or practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs one hour of pay at their regular rate of
11 pay for each workday that a 30 minute duty-free meal period was not provided. Defendants also
12 failed to keep accurate records of meal breaks taken by Plaintiffs in violation of Labor Code
13 §1174 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

14 21. Defendants also failed to adopt, implement, and enforce a uniform rest period
15 policy that complied with California law. Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to
16 take duty free rest periods of 10 minutes for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof,
17 by requiring Plaintiffs to regularly work through their rest periods to complete their duties, and
18 failing and refusing to provide a rest period for any hours in excess of 10 per day. As a result of
19 Defendants' lack of any meal or rest break policy that complies with California law, Defendants
20 have violated Labor Code §§512 and 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, among other
21 things.

22 22. Defendants also willfully failed to provide properly itemized wage statements to
23 Plaintiffs pursuant to Labor Code §226. Defendants, for example, fail to identify the correct
24 hours and rates of pay for hours worked for Defendants, including but not limited to violations of
25 Labor Code § 226(a)(9) by not setting forth “all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
26 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.” Defendants also
27 violate Labor Code §§ 226(a)(1) and 226(a)(5) by failing to correctly state the total net and gross
28 wages earned by failing to itemize meal and rest period premium payments, among other things.

Defendants also violate Labor Code § 226(a)(4) by failing to itemize all deductions on the wage statement, and Labor Code § 226(a)(8) by failing to state the name and address of the legal entity of Plaintiffs' employer. The failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements violates Labor Code §§226, 2699, et seq., and IWC Wage Orders.

23. Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely pay all compensation due and owing to Plaintiffs whose employment was terminated during the relevant time period, by failing to pay all of Plaintiff's compensation due upon termination by failing and refusing to pay overtime and straight time wages, failing to pay Plaintiffs for time worked during meal and rest periods, failing to pay Plaintiffs for an extra hour because Defendants failed to provide compliant meal and rest periods and/or to pay for such meal and rest period premiums at the regular rate of pay, and by Defendants' other unlawful actions as described herein. As such, Defendants are liable for accrued wages due, and waiting time penalties owed, in accordance with Labor Code §§201, 202, and 203.

24. Defendants further require that Plaintiffs use their personal cell phones during and after work, but Defendants fail and refuse to reimburse Plaintiffs for use of their personal cell phones in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

VI. PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM

25. On or about October 14, 2022, Plaintiffs provided written notice via certified mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

26. The LWDA failed to respond to Plaintiffs' counsel's correspondence dated October 14, 2022 and failed to notify Plaintiffs' counsel as to whether it would investigate the allegations contained therein, within 65 calendar days of the postmark date of Plaintiff's correspondence as required under Labor Code §2699.3. Plaintiffs have fully complied with the notice requirements set forth in Labor Code §2699.3 in order to commence a civil action against an employer pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

27. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs for all hours worked, minimum wages,

overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to pay all wages upon termination or resignation, unlawful deductions, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, will subject Defendants to civil penalties pursuant to, without limitation, Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 256, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 1198, 2699 and the IWC Wage Orders.

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

A. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

29. Labor Code §1194 states that any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

30. Labor Code §1197 states that the minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

31. Labor Code §510(a) and IWC Wage Orders regulating payment of wages in the state of California, provide that eight (8) hours of labor constitutes a day's work and any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one (1) workday and any work in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for each employee and any work in excess of twelve (12) hours in any one workday shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for each employee.

32. At all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiffs to perform work without compensation in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and the Labor Code. Specifically, Plaintiffs were not paid for all of their hours worked, in that Defendants failed to pay non-exempt hourly workers such as Plaintiffs for all of their hours worked by, among other things, not paying for time working to open and close retail stores, as well as other off-the-clock work responding to

work issues by their superiors. Defendants are therefore in violation of Labor Code §§510 and 1194, and the IWC Wage Orders.

33. Pursuant to Labor Code §218.6 and Civil Code §3287, Plaintiffs seek recovery of pre-judgment interest on all amounts recovered herein. Plaintiffs further request that this Court award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action pursuant to Labor Code §§1194(a) and/or 2699.

34. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not limited to Labor Code §§558, 1197.1, and 2699(f). Plaintiffs seek only to recover the civil penalties provided for in §§558(a) and 1197.1 for the violations alleged herein, and do not seek to recover underpaid wages.

B. MEAL PERIODS (Labor Code §§226.7 and 512)

35. Labor Code §512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders state that an employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, and an employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes. The applicable Wage Orders state that unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. Labor Code §226.7(a) further states that no employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the IWC. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from exerting coercion against the taking of, creating incentives to forego, or otherwise encouraging the skipping of legally protected breaks.

36. Plaintiffs were not provided with nor given the opportunity to take the requisite meal periods before the end of the first 5 hours of work, nor were they provided with or given the opportunity to take a proper second meal period during the days when they worked more than 10 hours in a day.

37. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.7(b) and the IWC Wage Orders, if an employer fails

1 to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of IWC
2 Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular
3 rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided. As such, Plaintiffs
4 are entitled to an additional one hour's pay for each day in which Plaintiffs were not provided a
5 proper meal break under the above-described authorities.

6 38. Labor Code §558 and the IWC Wage Orders state, in pertinent part, that any
7 employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated,
8 a section of any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the IWC shall be
9 subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
10 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an
11 amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages; (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred
12 dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
13 underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. Plaintiffs seek only to
14 recover the civil penalty provided for in §558(a) for the violations alleged herein, and do not
15 seek to recover underpaid wages.

16 39. Plaintiffs request that the Court award interest on all unpaid wages at the legal
17 rate specified by Civil Code §3289(b), accruing from the date the wages were due and payable
18 pursuant to Labor Code §218.6.

19 40. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
20 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
21 limited to Labor Code §§558 and 2699(f).

22 **C. REST PERIODS (Labor Code §226.7)**

23 41. The IWC Wage Orders provide that every employer shall authorize and permit all
24 employees to take rest periods. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours
25 worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four hours of work, or major
26 fraction thereof. An employer must provide employees with 10 minutes rest for shifts from three
27 and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six hours up to 10 hours,
28 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on. Furthermore, Labor Code

§1198 provides, in pertinent part: . . . The employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.”

42. Plaintiffs were not permitted to take proper rest periods and/or were required to work during any “rest periods” in contravention of California law. Further, Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees were required to waive the taking of their rest breaks because of the business of Defendants’ operations, and/or were coerced not to take legally mandated rest periods by Defendants’ criticizing, disciplining and/or reprimanding Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees who attempted to take legally required rest periods; failed to schedule rest periods; and pressured Plaintiffs to remain available during the workday.

43. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs a missed rest period premium payment for each rest period that was not authorized or permitted, and/or failed to pay such rest period premium at Plaintiffs’ regular rate of pay.

44. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.7(b) and IWC Wage Orders, if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

45. As such, Plaintiffs are entitled to an additional one hour of pay for each day in which they were not provided a proper rest period under the above-described authorities.

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

47. Labor Code §558 and IWC Wage Orders state, in pertinent part, that any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the IWC shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages; (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was

1 underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. Pursuant to Labor
2 Code §§558, 1198 and 2699, and/or IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs are entitled to civil penalties
3 for each pay period in which Defendants underpaid their wages as set forth herein. Plaintiffs
4 seek only to recover the civil penalty provided for in §558(a) for the violations alleged herein,
5 and do not seek to recover underpaid wages.

6 48. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
7 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
8 limited to Labor Code §§558, 2699(f), and applicable IWC Wage Orders.

9 **E. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**

10 49. Labor Code § 2802(a) states, in pertinent part: “An employer shall indemnify his
11 or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
12 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
13 the employer. . .”

14 50. Defendants required Plaintiffs to maintain and use their own personal cell phones
15 to conduct company business, but Defendants failed and refused to reimburse Plaintiffs for using
16 their cell phones for company business.

17 51. Defendants’ failure to reimburse and/or indemnify Plaintiffs for these necessary
18 expenditures constitutes a violation of California law.

19 52. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
20 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
21 limited to Labor Code § 2699(f).

22 **F. FAILURE TO PROPERLY MAINTAIN AND SUBMIT ACCURATE**
23 **ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS (Labor Code §226)**

24 53. Labor Code §§226, 1174, and/or the applicable IWC Wage Orders require
25 employers to maintain and provide employees accurate time and employment records, as well as
26 itemized wage statements showing, among other things, gross wages earned, the total hours
27 worked by the employee, all deductions, net wages earned, all applicable hourly rates in effect
28 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the

1 employee. Furthermore, the applicable Wage Orders and Labor Code §226 requires every
2 employer to keep accurate information with respect to each employee, including: (1) the
3 employee's full name, home address, occupation, social security number, employee's date of
4 birth, and time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period; (2) an
5 employee's meal periods; (3) total wages paid each payroll period; and (4) total hours worked
6 during the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

7 54. Defendants failed to properly maintain itemized wage statements in that, among
8 other things, the wage statements provided do not set forth the accurate number of hours worked,
9 correct rates of pay, all overtime compensation, meal periods, premium pay, proper deductions,
10 and other related information required by California law. In addition, in implementing their
11 illegal rest period policies and practices regarding Plaintiffs, Defendants failed to record wages
12 for rest period and meal period premiums and other wages that should have been paid to
13 Plaintiffs as required by California law. Defendants have failed to record all items delineated in
14 Labor Code §226 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and required under Labor Code §1174.
15 Plaintiffs are informed and believe that these failures were knowing and intentional by
16 Defendants as Defendants sought to deprive Plaintiffs of their legitimate right to unpaid wages,
17 and otherwise deprive them of their proper compensation. As a result of Defendants' intentional
18 and knowing failure to maintain adequate itemized statements, Plaintiffs could not ascertain the
19 actual amount of compensation they earned and/or were entitled to, and thereby are presumed to
20 have suffered cognizable injury in the form of the accrual of unpaid wages, overtime, and
21 interest pursuant to Labor Code §226(e)(2).

22 55. Pursuant to Labor Code §226(e), an employee who suffers injury as a
23 result of an employer's knowing and intentional failure to comply with subdivision (a), is
24 entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period
25 in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a
26 subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and
27 is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees.

28 56. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.3, "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of

1 Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
2 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee
3 for each violation in a subsequent citation. . .”

4 57. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
5 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
6 limited to Labor Code §§226.3, 1174.5 and 2699(f), as well as reasonable attorneys’ fees and
7 costs.

8 **G. WAITING TIME PENALTIES (Labor Code §§201-203)**

9 58. Labor Code §201 states that an employer is required to provide an employee who
10 is terminated all unpaid wages immediately upon termination.

11 59. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants failed to
12 pay Plaintiffs all wages due and owing immediately upon termination, thereby violating Labor
13 Code §201.

14 60. Labor Code §202 states, in pertinent part, that an employer is required to provide
15 an employee who quits his or her employment all wages due and owing not later than 72 hours
16 thereafter.

17 61. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants failed to
18 pay Plaintiffs all wages due and owing upon voluntary resignation, thereby violating Labor Code
19 §202.

20 62. Labor Code §203 states that if an employer willfully fails to pay an employee
21 wages according to Labor Code §§201 and 202, these wages shall continue as a penalty for up to
22 a maximum of 30 days.

23 63. Defendants willfully withheld paying Plaintiffs wages thereby violating Labor
24 Code §203, as further set forth herein. As such, Defendants are required to pay Plaintiffs a 30-
25 day wage penalty in addition to all unpaid wages as described herein.

26 64. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
27 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
28 limited to Labor Code §§256 and 2699(f).

1 **H. ALL CLAIMS**

2 65. Pursuant to Labor Code §2699, Plaintiffs seek to recover civil penalties, as
3 otherwise provided by statute and wage order, for which Defendants are liable as a result of their
4 violations of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Order(s) in an amount to be proven at trial.
5 These penalties include, but are not limited to, those provided by Labor Code §§210, 225.5,
6 226.3, 256, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699. Plaintiffs further seek an award of reasonable
7 attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to the Labor Code §2699(g)(1) and any other applicable
8 statute.

9 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs pray:

- 10 a. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §2699(f), in addition to and entirely
11 independent and apart from other penalties in the Labor Code and for Labor Code
12 violations without a specific civil penalty, in the amount of \$100 for each
13 aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation, and \$200 for each
14 aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 15 b. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §558, as follows:
- 16 i. For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved underpaid
17 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid;
- 18 ii. For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
19 aggrieved underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
20 employee was underpaid;
- 21 c. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §1197.1, as follows:
- 22 i. For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred
23 dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which
24 the employee is underpaid;
- 25 ii. For each subsequent violation for the same offense, two hundred fifty
26 dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved underpaid employee for each pay period
27 for which the employee was underpaid regardless of whether the initial
28 violation is intentionally committed;

1 d. For civil penalties per Labor Code §226.3 in the amount of \$250 for each
2 aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation, and \$1,000 for each aggrieved employee
3 per pay period for each subsequent violation;

4 e. For civil penalties per Labor Code §1174.5 in the amount of \$500 for each willful
5 failure to maintain records as required by Labor Code §1174(c);

6 f. For civil penalties per Labor Code §256 in the amount of one day of pay, at the
7 same rate, for each day that an aggrieved employee was paid late, at the time of
8 termination, until payment was/is made, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days;

9 g. For civil penalties per Labor Code §210 in the amount of \$100 for each failure to
10 pay each employee, and for each subsequent violation, or any willful or
11 intentional violation, \$200 for each failure to pay each employee;

12 h. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred; and

13 i. For such relief as this Court may deem just and proper.
14

15 Dated: December 19, 2022

BARTZ LAW GROUP APC

16
17 By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
AARON A. BARTZ
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff JUDDY SAENZ, on behalf
19 of herself and all other aggrieved employees
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

Dated: December 19, 2022

By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
AARON A. BARTZ
Attorneys for Plaintiff JUDDY SAENZ, on
behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees