


DANIEL F. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 251488
daniel@gaineslawfirm.com
ALEX P. KATOFISKY, ESQ. SBN 202754
alex@gaineslawfirm.com
EVAN S. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 287668
evan@gaineslawfirm.com
GAINES & GAINES, APLC
4550 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Suite 100
Westlake Village, California 91362
Telephone: (818) 703-8985
Facsimile: (818) 703-8984

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

JAN 27 2023

BY: 
Jasmine Segura, Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jason Ruiz, on behalf of himself, the general public, and all "aggrieved employees" pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

CIV SB 2303590

CASE NO:

CIV SB 2303590

JASON RUIZ, on behalf of himself, the
general public, and all "aggrieved employees"
pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Plaintiffs,

v.

SUPERIOR TRANSPORTATION
ASSOCIATES, INC., a Nevada corporation,
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

**1. FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME
WAGES DUE (LABOR CODE §§ 510 AND
1194)**

**2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST
PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU
THEREOF (LABOR CODE § 226.7; IWC
WAGE ORDER 9-2001)**

**3. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL
PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU
THEREOF (LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512,
558, 1174, AND 1174.; IWC WAGE ORDER
9-2001)**

**4. KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED
EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT
PROVISIONS (LABOR CODE § 226(a), (e))**

**5. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES
DUE AT SEPARATION OF
EMPLOYMENT (LABOR CODE §§ 201-
203)**

**6. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND
PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**

**7. PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR
CODE § 2699(f) FOR VIOLATIONS OF
LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, 226(a), 226.7,**

**510, 512, AND 1194 AND PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE § 2699(a) FOR
VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE §§ 226.3
AND 558**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff JASON RUIZ (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and on behalf of all similarly situated individuals (the “Class” or “Class Members”), on behalf of the general public, and under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, complains of SUPERIOR TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATES, INC., a Nevada corporation, and any subsidiaries or affiliated companies (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) as follows:

I.

INTRODUCTION AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. This is a Class Action and Representative Action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, on behalf of Plaintiff and all other employees who work or formerly worked for Defendants within the State of California.

2. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the present (the “liability period”), Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all overtime wages due to Class I Members (as defined below); provide legally compliant rest and meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof to Class I and II Members; maintain accurate employment records for Class I and II Members; provide accurately itemized wage statements to Class I and II Members; and timely pay certain Class I and II Members all wages due at the separation of their employment.

3. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and members of each Class, brings this action pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, and 1194, seeking compensation for all unpaid wages, civil and statutory penalties, injunctive and other equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

4. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and Class Members, and pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208, also seeks injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendants enjoyed from their failure to pay all wages due.

5. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all Aggrieved Employees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*, seek penalties for Defendants' various violations of the California Labor Code.

6. Venue is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395 because Defendants employed Plaintiff and Class Members throughout the State of California, including San Bernardino County.

II.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

7. Plaintiff JASON RUIZ was employed by Defendants from April 2021 through April 2022 in Orange County, California.

8. During his work with Defendants, Plaintiff was:

- a. Willfully denied the payment of all overtime wages due;
- b. Willfully denied rest and meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- c. Willfully denied accurately itemized wage statements; and
- d. Willfully denied the timely payment of all wages upon separation of their employment.

B. Defendants

9. Defendant SUPERIOR TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATES, INC. is a Nevada corporation that employed Plaintiff and Class Members in San Bernardino County, California.

10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sue Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint scheme,

1 business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally
2 attributable to the other Defendants.

3 12. The Defendants named herein as DOE 1 through DOE 10 are and were persons acting
4 on behalf of, or acting jointly with, Defendants, who violated, or caused to be violated, one or more
5 provisions of the California Labor Code as alleged herein.

6 **III.**

7 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

8 13. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a
9 Class Action pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff seeks to represent the
10 following Classes composed of and defined as follows:

11 **CLASS I**

12 All persons employed as exempt from overtime by Defendants in
13 California at any time since the date four years preceding the filing of
14 this Action, plus any additional time tolled by the California State
15 Judicial Council pursuant to Emergency Rule 9 in response to the
16 COVID-19 pandemic and continuing through the present.

17 **CLASS II**

18 All persons employed as non-exempt employees by Defendants in
19 California at any time since the date four years preceding the filing of
20 this Action, plus any additional time tolled by the California State
21 Judicial Council pursuant to Emergency Rule 9 in response to the
22 COVID-19 pandemic and continuing through the present.

23 14. Plaintiff reserves the right under Rule 3.765, California Rules of Court, to amend or
24 modify this class description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation
25 to particular issues.

26 15. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under
27 the provisions of § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community of
28 interest in the litigation and each proposed Class is easily ascertainable.

1 **A. Numerosity**

2 16. The potential members of each Class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all
3 Class Members is impracticable. While the precise number of members of each Class has not been
4 ascertained at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
5 currently employ, and during the relevant time periods employed, over 50 persons in the State of
6 California who fall within each Class definition.

7 17. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant period necessarily increases this
8 number. Plaintiff alleges Defendants' employment records would provide information as to the
9 number and location of members of each Class. Joinder of members of each Class is not practicable.

10 **B. Commonality**

11 18. There are questions of law and fact common to each Class that predominate over any
12 questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common questions of law and fact include,
13 without limitation:

- 14 a. Whether Defendants fail to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and Class I Members,
15 in violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001;
16 b. Whether Defendants failed to properly provide rest periods or compensation in
17 lieu thereof to Plaintiff and Class I and II Members, in violation of Labor Code
18 § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001;
19 c. Whether Defendants failed to properly provide meal periods or compensation
20 in lieu thereof to Plaintiff and Class I and II Members, in violation of Labor
21 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage Order 9-2001;
22 d. Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class I and II Members
23 with accurately itemized wage statements, in accordance with Labor Code §
24 226(a) and (e);
25 e. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and Class I and II Members
26 all wages due and owing at the separation of their employment, in violation of
27 Labor Code §§ 201-203; and
28

g. Whether Plaintiff and Class I Members are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

C. Typicality

19. The claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of members of each Class. Plaintiff and members of each Class sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of laws, regulations that have the force and effect of law, and statutes as alleged herein.

D. Adequacy of Representation

20. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of members of each Class. Counsel who represents Plaintiff are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions.

E. Superiority of Class Action

21. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all proposed members of each Class is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the proposed Classes predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of each proposed Class. Each member of the proposed Classes has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and/or practices.

22. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system. Plaintiff are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

1 IV.

2 CAUSES OF ACTION

3 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

4 PLAINTIFF AND CLASS I AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

5 FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES DUE

6 (LABOR CODE §§ 510 AND 1194)

7 23. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 of this Complaint as though fully set
8 forth herein.

9 24. Defendants failed to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and Class I Members
10 (those misclassified as overtime-exempt), in violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage
11 Order 9-2001. Defendant misclassified Plaintiff and Class I Members as overtime-exempt employees.
12 They were never paid premium overtime wages. Plaintiff and Class I Members misclassified as
13 overtime-exempt were not paid the correct minimum salary of at least twice the applicable minimum
14 wage to qualify for an overtime exemption. Their duties also failed to fall into any exemption.

15 25. As a result of their misclassification, when Plaintiff and Class I Members misclassified
16 as overtime-exempt worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday or in excess of forty (40) hours
17 in a workweek, they were not paid proper overtime wages of one-and-one-half times the regular rate
18 of pay, nor were they paid twice the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12)
19 in a workday or eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek. These failures to pay all overtime
20 wages due constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 558 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001.

21 26. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants in willfully failing to pay all wages due,
22 Plaintiff and members of Class I have been deprived of wages in amounts to be determined at trial
23 and are entitled to restitution and recovery of such amounts, plus interest thereon, attorneys' fees, and
24 costs, pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.

25 Wherefore, Plaintiff and each Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

26 \\\

27 \\\

28 \\\

V.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AND CLASSES I AND II AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF

(LABOR CODE § 226.7 AND IWC WAGE ORDER 9-2001)

27. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 26 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

28. Plaintiff and Class I and II Members are entitled to one hour of pay for each day that Defendants failed to properly provide one or more rest periods as set forth in Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001.

29. Defendants failed to pay proper premium wages to Plaintiff and Class I and II Members who were denied rest periods, in violation of Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001. Plaintiff and Class Members were routinely unable to take a 10-minute rest period for every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, but were not paid premium wages of one hour's pay at the correct rate for each missed rest period. They were simply denied and not authorized to take their legally entitled rest periods and were not paid premium wages for missed rest periods. This violates Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001.

30. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001, Plaintiff seeks the payment of all rest period compensation that they and Class I and II Members are owed, according to proof.

Wherefore, Plaintiff and each Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

1 VI.

2 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

3 PLAINTIFF AND CLASSES I AND II AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

4 FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF

5 (LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 1174, AND 1174.5 AND IWC WAGE ORDER 9-2001)

6 31. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this Complaint as though fully set
7 forth herein.

8 32. Plaintiff and Class I and II Members are entitled to one hour of pay for each day that
9 Defendants failed to properly provide one or more meal periods as set forth in Labor Code §§ 226.7
10 and 512 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001.

11 33. Defendants failed to pay proper premium wages to Plaintiff and other Class I and II
12 Members who were denied proper meal periods, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and
13 IWC Wage Order 9-2001. Plaintiff and Class I and II Members were routinely denied, and not
14 authorized to take, a timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that
15 exceeded five hours, or a second timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked
16 that exceeded ten hours, but were not paid premium wages of one hour's pay at the correct rate for
17 each missed first or second meal period. When they were able to take a meal period, they would be
18 late or cut short. This violates Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001.

19 34. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Order 9-2001, Plaintiff seek
20 the payment of all meal period compensation and unpaid wages that Class I and II Members are owed
21 for four years preceding the filing of this Action, according to proof.

22 Wherefore, Plaintiff and each Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

23 \\\

24 \\\

25 \\\

26 \\\

27 \\\

28 \\\

VII.
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
PLAINTIFF AND CLASSES I AND II AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED
EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS
(LABOR CODE § 226(a), (e))

35. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 34 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

36. Section 226(a) of the California Labor Code requires Defendants to provide wage statements to employees. In those wage statements, Defendants must provide an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (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 only 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. Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).

37. Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Class I and II Members wage statements that fully and accurately itemized the requirements set forth in Labor Code § 226(a). As Plaintiff and members of each Class were not paid all wages due, as stated above, the wage statements provided by Defendants failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

38. Furthermore, as to Plaintiff and Class I Members, the wage statements issued to them failed to set forth all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), because they omit any applicable rates of pay and the hours worked at each rate.

39. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct in failing to provide members of each Class with accurate itemized wage statements, Plaintiff and members of each Class have been injured because they have not been paid all wages due and were issued wage statements which do not reflect, and fail to state, all information required by Labor Code § 226(a). The missing information cannot be discerned at all from the face of the wage statements himself. Plaintiff and Class I and II Members are entitled to penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) to recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50 for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, and are entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code § 226(h).

Wherefore, Plaintiff and each Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

VIII.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AND CLASSES I AND II AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DUE AT

SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT

(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203)

41. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 40 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

42. California Labor Code § 201 and § 202 require Defendants to pay employees all wages due within 72 hours after resignation of employment or the day of termination of employment. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to timely pay such wages, the employer must, as a penalty, continue to pay the subject employee's daily wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced. The penalty cannot exceed 30 days of wages.

43. Defendants paid Plaintiff and members of each Class their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, in violation of Labor Code § 203. Plaintiff and members of each Class were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment, as detailed above. Consequently, at the time of their separation from employment with Defendants, they were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-202 and is alleged on behalf of Plaintiff and members of each Class no longer employed by Defendants.

44. More than 30 days have passed since Plaintiff and members of each Class have left Defendants' employ.

45. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct in not paying wages owed timely upon separation of employment, Plaintiff and members of each Class are entitled to up to 30 days' wages as a penalty under Labor Code § 203 for Defendants' failure to timely pay legal wages at separation of employment.

Wherefore, Plaintiff and each Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

IX.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AND CLASSES I AND II AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

UNFAIR COMPETITION PURSUANT TO

BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 ET SEQ.

46. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 45 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

47. This is a Class Action for Unfair Business Practices. Plaintiff, on his own behalf and on behalf of the general public, and on behalf of others similarly situated, brings this claim pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* The conduct of all Defendants as alleged in this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, the general public, and Class I and II Members. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

1 48. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code § 17204,
2 and therefore have standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive relief, restitution, and other
3 appropriate equitable relief.

4 49. Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* prohibits unlawful and unfair business
5 practices.

6 50. Wage and hour laws express fundamental public policies. Properly providing
7 employees with all wages due is a fundamental public policy of this State and of the United States.
8 Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of this State to enforce vigorously minimum labor
9 standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to work under substandard and
10 unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding employers and its employees from competitors who
11 lower their costs by failing to comply with minimum labor standards.

12 51. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct alleged
13 in this Complaint, Defendants, and each of them, have acted contrary to these public policies, have
14 violated specific provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair
15 business practices in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* depriving Plaintiff,
16 and all persons similarly situated, and all interested persons of rights, benefits, and privileges
17 guaranteed to all employees under law.

18 52. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes unfair competition in violation of
19 §17200 *et seq.* of the Business & Professions Code.

20 53. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, either knew or in the exercise
21 of reasonable care should have known that the conduct was unlawful. As such, it is a violation of §
22 17200 *et seq.* of the Business & Professions Code.

23 54. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and others
24 similarly situated have been damaged in a sum as may be proven.

25 55. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to engage in the unlawful
26 conduct, as alleged above. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, this Court
27 should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary
28 to prevent the use or employment, by Defendants, its agents, or employees, of any unlawful or

1 deceptive practice prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, and/or, including but not limited
2 to, disgorgement of profits which may be necessary to restore Plaintiff and Class I and II Members to
3 the money Defendants have unlawfully failed to pay.

4 **X.**

5 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **PLAINTIFF AND ALL AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS**
7 **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699(f) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR**
8 **CODE §§ 201, 202, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, AND 1194 AND PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE**
9 **§ 2699(a) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE §§ 226.3 AND 558**

10 56. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 55 of this Complaint as though fully set
11 forth herein.

12 57. As a result of the acts alleged above, including the Labor Code violations set forth
13 above, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*

14 58. For each such violation, Plaintiff and all of Defendant's exempt and non-exempt
15 California employees employed during the one (1) year prior to Plaintiff exhausting the administrative
16 remedies pursuant to PAGA ("Aggrieved Employees") are entitled to penalties and other relief in an
17 amount to be shown at the time of trial subject to the following formula:

- 18 a. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f), \$100 for each initial violation and \$200 for
19 each subsequent violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512,
20 and 1194; and
21 b. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f), the penalties as authorized by Labor Code
22 §§ 226.3 and 558.

23 59. Civil penalties recovered will be allocated 75% to the Labor and Workforce
24 Development Agency, and 25% to the affected employees.

25 60. On November 15, 2022, Plaintiff sent a letter, by online submission to the LWDA and
26 by certified mail, return receipt requested, to Defendants setting forth the facts and theories of the
27 violations alleged against Defendants, as prescribed by Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* Pursuant to Labor
28 Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A), no notice was received by Plaintiff from the LWDA within sixty-five (65)

calendar days of November 15, 2022. Plaintiff may therefore commence this action to seek civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

1. For compensatory damages pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, in the amount of all unpaid overtime wages due to Plaintiff and Class I Members;
2. For compensatory damages in the amount of one hour of wages for each day on which a meal and/or rest period was not properly provided to Plaintiff and members of each Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
3. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) for Plaintiff and members of each Class;
4. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for Plaintiff and members of each Class;
5. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* for Plaintiff and Class I and II Members;
6. An award of prejudgment and post-judgment interest;
7. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* for Plaintiff and all other members of each Class;
8. An award providing for payment of costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(h), 1194, 2699(g)(1), and other applicable law;
9. An award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(h), 1194, 2699(g)(1), and other applicable law; and
10. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: January 26, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

GAINES & GAINES
A Professional Law Corporation

By: Daniel F. Gaines
DANIEL F. GAINES
EVAN S. GAINES
Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

Dated: January 26, 2023

GAINES & GAINES
A Professional Law Corporation

DANIEL F. GAINES
EVAN S. GAINES
Attorneys for Plaintiff