

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
kane.moon@moonyanglaw.com
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan (SBN 320389)
lilit@moonyanglaw.com
Jessica M. Abreu (SBN 343366)
jessica.abreu@moonyanglaw.com
MOON & YANG, APC
1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff Lizeth Piceno Sanchez

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

LIZETH PICENO SANCHEZ, individually, and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SEVERN PEANUT COMPANY, INC., a North
Carolina company; RANDSTAD INHOUSE
SERVICES, LLC, a limited liability company;
RANDSTAD INHOUSE SERVICES, L.P., a
limited partnership; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: MCV087826S

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION AND
PAGA REPRESENTATION ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [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 Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226]; and
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.].
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff.....	3
B. Defendants.....	3
ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	5
CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS	9
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION.....	13
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION.....	14
THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	16
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	16
FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	17
SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	18
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	19
EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION	20
NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION	23
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	26
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	30

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

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants Severn Peanut Company, Inc.,
6 Randstad Inhouse Services, LLC, Randstad Inhouse Services, L.P., and Does 1 through 10
7 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and unfair
8 business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay
9 overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods,
10 failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all
11 wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to
12 furnish accurate wage statements.

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

19 3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
20 California Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
21 Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present employees of Defendants (hereinafter
22 referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

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

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

- 3 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
4 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
5 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 6 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
7 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
8 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and
9 failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period
10 violation occurred;
- 11 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
12 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
13 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
14 period violation occurred;
- 15 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 16 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
17 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within
18 the time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
19 and
- 20 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked.
- 21 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
22 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
23 IWC Wage Orders.

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

A. Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Madera, State of California, as a machine operator primarily in Madera county, from approximately 2020 to July 2022.

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

B. Defendants

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Severn Peanut Company, Inc. is:

- (a) A North Carolina corporation with its principal places of business in Madera, California;
- (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Madera County;
- (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions; and
- (d) At all times mentioned herein, Defendants are and were the joint employers of Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Randstad Inhouse Services, L.P. is:

- 1 (a) A limited partnership with its principal places of business in Madera,
2 California;
- 3 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
4 State of California, including in Madera County;
- 5 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
6 of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the
7 Class and Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages,
8 hours, or working conditions; and
- 9 (d) At all times mentioned herein, Defendants are and were the joint employers
10 of Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

11 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
12 alleges, that Defendant Randstad Inhouse Services, LLC is:

- 13 (a) A limited liability company with its principal places of business in Madera,
14 California;
- 15 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
16 State of California, including in Madera County;
- 17 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer
18 of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the
19 Class and Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages,
20 hours, or working conditions; and
- 21 (d) At all times mentioned herein, Defendants are and were the joint employers
22 of Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

23 13. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or
24 entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious
25 names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages
26 suffered by Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will
27 amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they
28 have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

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

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

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

19 16. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of
20 Madera, State of California, as a machine operator from approximately 2020 to July 2022.
21 During the statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's
22 overtime requirements, and paid Plaintiff an hourly wage.

23 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
24 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
25 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
26 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all
27 final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
28

1 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
2 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

3 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
4 not paying Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all
5 overtime wages. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved
6 Employees occasionally worked off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and
7 the Class and Aggrieved Employees were required to wait in line in order to clock into work each
8 workday, and when returning from meal breaks, off the clock and uncompensated. Also during
9 certain time periods, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo
10 COVID screening prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff
11 and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to clock out and continue to
12 finish paperwork prior to leaving, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Class
13 and Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to use their personal cellular telephones for
14 work purposes while off the clock, and uncompensated. Also during the statutory period,
15 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses and other
16 remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the
17 correct overtime rate of pay, sick day rate of pay, and meal break premium rate of pay, leading to
18 underpayment.

19 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
20 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods.
21 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved
22 Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute,
23 continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without
24 compensating Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not
25 provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not
26 adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal
27 period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the
28 tenth hour of work. Defendants also failed to accurately record meal periods. Accordingly,

1 Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Class and
2 Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

3 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
4 and permit Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest
5 periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved
6 Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and
7 permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four
8 hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Class
9 and Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants
10 also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees of their right to
11 take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting
12 or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees, nor did
13 Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants
14 also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Class and
15 Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not
16 maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot
17 demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the
18 middle of each work period. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were also not
19 permitted to leave the premises during rest breaks. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice
20 was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take rest
21 periods in compliance with California law.

22 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the
23 Class and Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their
24 duties for Defendants without reimbursement, including the purchase of tools and masks. Also,
25 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were required to use their personal cellular
26 telephones for work purposes, without reimbursement.

27 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
28 pay Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all

1 wages for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period
2 premium wages.

3 23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Class
4 and Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly
5 rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned
6 for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not
7 provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not
8 authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address).
9 Further, the wage statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As
10 a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Class and
11 Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 12 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
13 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
14 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
15 entitled;
- 16 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
17 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
18 though they had not been;
- 19 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid
20 minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages
21 at the correct California rate even though they were;
- 22 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
23 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
24 California rate even though they had not been;
- 25 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
26 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 27 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
28 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have

1 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
2 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
3 statements contained the required accurate information;

4 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to
5 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,
6 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;

7 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
8 rates to which Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were
9 entitled, and Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were paid
10 less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

11 Thus, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in
12 California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

13 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

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

19 26. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

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

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

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

26 29. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is
27 readily ascertainable:
28

- 1 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
2 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
3 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
4 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the
5 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
6 Defendants' records.
- 7 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
8 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
9 defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any)
10 are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.
- 11 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
12 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
13 defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated
14 herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class
15 Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in
16 the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.
17 Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will
18 continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be
19 necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
20 benefit of each class member.
- 21 (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the
22 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration
23 of:
- 24 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually
 - 25 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
 - 26 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy
 - 27 already commenced by or against members of the Class;
 - 28 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 damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

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

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum wages, and overtime wages;
 - (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
 - (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to Class Members;
 - (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge or resignation;
 - (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
 - (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses;
- and

(g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

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

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

1 those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
2 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
3 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
4 the class as a whole.

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

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours**
14 **Worked)**

15 33. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
16 paragraphs 1 through 23 in this First Amended Complaint.

17 34. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of
18 an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or
19 not required to do so.

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

25 36. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
26 recover minimum wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

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

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

39. 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 and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

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

41. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees all such wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

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

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

43. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this First Amended Complaint.

1 44. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
2 employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless
3 they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

4 45. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall
5 not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional
6 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
7 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed
8 by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

9 46. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees have
10 worked more than eight hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

11 47. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class and
12 Aggrieved Employees overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the
13 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198.
14 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are regularly required to work overtime hours.

15 48. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
16 compensation to the Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees for their overtime hours
17 worked, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees have suffered, and will continue to
18 suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them but which exceed the
19 jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

20 49. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
21 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
22 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

23 50. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees also request recovery of overtime
24 compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor
25 Code § 1194(a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum
26 as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

27 51. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all
28 wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall

1 pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all
2 overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class
3 and Aggrieved Employees with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code §
4 204.

5 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

7 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
8 paragraphs 1 through 23 in this First Amended Complaint.

9 53. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
10 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees of all duty in order to take their first daily meal
11 periods no later than the start of Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employee's sixth hour of
12 work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh
13 hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the
14 applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30
15 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California
16 Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated
17 under any Wage Order.

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

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

27 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

56. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this First Amended Complaint.

57. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 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 Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage Order.

58. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than 4 hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)

60. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this First Amended Complaint.

61. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees for their

1 necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties
2 or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

3 62. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were damaged at
4 least in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their
5 wages.

6 63. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees they represent are entitled to
7 attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest
8 pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(b).

9 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees –** 11 **Waiting Time Penalties)**

12 64. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
13 paragraphs 1 through 23 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

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

26 67. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those Class members who are no longer
27 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within
28

seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

68. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

69. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

70. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)

71. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

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

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

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

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

77. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

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

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code
§§ 17200, et seq.)**

79. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

81. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

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

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

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

84. Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

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

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked

86. Defendants’ failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

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

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

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

Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses

89. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

90. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

92. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

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

1 restitution.

2 94. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further
3 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
4 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,
5 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
6 practices in the future.

7 95. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no
8 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
9 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
10 practices. As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
11 above, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and
12 will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained
13 from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

14 96. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
15 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
16 withholdings.

17 97. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and
18 putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
19 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
20 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and
21 Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §
22 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

23 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
25 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

26 98. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
27 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.
28

1 99. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
2 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

3 100. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
4 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law,
5 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
6 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions,
7 commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative,
8 be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or
9 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section
10 2699.3.”

11 101. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
12 Code § 2699.3. On May 8, 2022, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and
13 Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of
14 the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former Aggrieved
15 Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. At the time of this filing, 65
16 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development
17 Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed
18 in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor
19 Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint.
20 These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210,
21 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

22 102. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California
23 Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any
24 entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by
25 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
26 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins
27 and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.
28

1 Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total
2 hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

3 103. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
4 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to
5 maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when employees
6 begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by
7 the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to
8 know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of
9 their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
10 Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an
11 unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
12 Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment
13 of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel
14 Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts
15 according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code
16 and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an
17 injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments
18 paid to them.

19 104. Based on the conduct described in this First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled
20 to an award of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved
21 Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to
22 be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted
23 by law.

24 105. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant
25 to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action
26 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."
27
28

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

5 **Class Certification**

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

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

- 11 4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
12 Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
13 minimum wages due;
14 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
15 6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
16 such amounts were due;
17 7. For liquidated damages;
18 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
19 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
20 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

21 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

- 22 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
23 Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
24 overtime wages due;
25 11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;
26 12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from
27 the date such amounts were due;
28 13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to

1 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

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

3 As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

12 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

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

15 21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

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

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

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

21 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

22 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
23 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

24 26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
25 appropriate;

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

28 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 California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;

31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;

32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

35. 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;

36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

46. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

47. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof.
For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, et seq., and all other applicable
Labor Code provisions;

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

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

As to all Causes of Action

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

Dated: December 13, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

MOON & YANG, APC

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

By: _____


Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Jessica M. Abreu
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

Dated: December 13, 2022

MOON & YANG, APC

By: _____


Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Jessica M. Abreu
Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

3 I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not
a party to the within suit; my business address is 1055 W. 7th Street, Suite 1880, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

4 On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **FIRST AMENDED CLASS**
5 **ACTION AND PAGA REPRESENTATION ACTION COMPLAINT** on the interested parties
in this action by sending ☐ the original ☒ a true copy thereof ☒ to interested parties as follows
6 ☐ as stated on the attached service list:

7 Ronald H. Barsamian

Patrick S. Moody

8 Seth G. Meluien

Catherine M. Houlihan

9 **BARSAMIAN & MOODY**

1141 West Shaw Avenue, Suite 104

10 Fresno, California 93711

Telephone: (559) 248-2360

11 Facsimile: (559) 248-2370

E-mail: LaborLaw@TheEmployersLawFirm.com

12 e-mail: ronbarsamian@aol.com

E-mail: pmoody@theemployerslawfirm.com

13 E-mail: smehrten@theemployerslawfirm.com

14 E-mail: choulihan@theemployerslawfirm.com

15 Counsel for Defendant Severn Peanut Company,
Inc.

1505 Corporation 538 Corporation Service
Company Which Will Do Business In California
As CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

Registered Agent for Defendant
Randstad Inhouse Services, LLC

1505 Corporation 538 Corporation Service
Company Which Will Do Business In California
As CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

Registered Agent for Defendant
Randstad Inhouse Services, L.P

22 ☒ **BY U.S. MAIL:** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The
23 envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am “readily familiar” with the
24 firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice
25 it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully
26 prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on
motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage
meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
2 true and correct. Executed this **December 13, 2022** at Los Angeles, California.

3
4 Karen Castillo
Type or Print Name

Karen Castillo
Signature