

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Mel Red Recana

1 MICHAEL R. CROSNER (SBN 41299)  
mike@crosnerlegal.com  
2 ZACHARY M. CROSNER (SBN 272295)  
zach@crosnerlegal.com  
3 JAMIE SERB (SBN 289601)  
jamie@crosnerlegal.com  
4 **CROSNER LEGAL, PC**  
5 9440 Santa Monica Blvd. Suite 301  
6 Beverly Hills, CA 90210  
7 Tel: (310) 496-5818  
8 Fax: (310) 510-6429

Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

12 CRISTIAN MONTTOYA, on behalf of the  
13 State of California, the Labor Workforce  
Development Agency, as a private attorney  
14 general, and on behalf of all aggrieved  
employees,

15 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 GRECO ENTERTAINMENT GROUP,  
19 INC., a California corporation; 2454  
WILSHIRE RESTAURANT, LLC, a  
20 California limited liability company; 2460  
WILSHIRE RESTAURANT LLC, a  
21 California limited liability company; and  
DOES 1-100, inclusive,

22 Defendants.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No.: 23STCV00656

**PLAINTIFF'S REPRESENTATIVE  
COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE  
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT,  
CAL. LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, et  
seq.**

1 Plaintiff CRISTIAN MONTOYA (“PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of the State of California, the  
2 Labor Workforce Development Agency, as a private attorney general, and on behalf of all  
3 Aggrieved Employees (defined below), hereby files this Complaint against Defendants GRECO  
4 ENTERTAINMENT GROUP, INC., a California corporation; 2454 WILSHIRE RESTAURANT,  
5 LLC, a California limited liability company; 2460 WILSHIRE RESTAURANT LLC, a California  
6 limited liability company; and DOES 1-100, inclusive, (collectively referred to herein as  
7 “DEFENDANTS”). PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges as follows:

### 8 **INTRODUCTION**

9 1. This is a representative action filed by PLAINTIFF on behalf of all Aggrieved  
10 Employees and the State of California against DEFENDANTS, pursuant to California’s Private  
11 Attorneys General Act, Labor Code section 2698 et. seq. (“PAGA”), to recover civil penalties (75%  
12 payable to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and 25% payable to Aggrieved  
13 Employees) for DEFENDANTS’ violations of the California Labor Code as alleged below.

14 2. The California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) is a  
15 California governmental entity. PLAINTIFF has been delegated authority to sue on behalf of the  
16 LWDA pursuant to PAGA.

### 17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 3. This Court has jurisdiction over PLAINTIFF’s representative claims for penalties on  
19 behalf of Aggrieved Employees and the State of California pursuant to California statutes, including  
20 but not limited to the PAGA, and decisional law and regulations.

21 4. Venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles pursuant to California Code of Civil  
22 Procedure section 395.5 because DEFENDANTS transact business within this judicial district and  
23 some of the acts, omissions, and conduct alleged by PLAINTIFF herein occurred in this judicial  
24 district. Also, see, *Crestwood Behavioral Health, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2021) 60 Cal.App.5th  
25 1069 (venue in a PAGA action is proper in any county where the defendants committed Labor Code  
26 violations against some of its employees).

### 27 **THE PARTIES**

28 5. PLAINTIFF, is, and at all relevant times, was an individual domiciled in the State of

1 California and a citizen of the State of California. PLAINTIFF is currently employed by  
2 DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt employee.

3 6. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS during the PAGA Period (defined below)  
4 as a cook and/or similar title at DEFENDANTS' restaurant/facility, including but not limited to,  
5 DEFENDANTS' restaurant located at 2454 Wilshire Blvd Santa Monica, CA 90403, operating  
6 under the name Fia Restaurant.

7 7. DEFENDANTS are either a California limited liability company or California  
8 corporation that, at all relevant times, were authorized to do business within the State of California  
9 and are doing business in the State of California.

10 8. DEFENDANTS own, operate, or otherwise manage several restaurants, venues,  
11 facilities, and/or locations in California, including but not limited to, three restaurants in Santa  
12 Monica operating under the following names: Fia Restaurant, Fia Steak and Dono.<sup>1</sup>

13 9. The true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants sued herein as DOES 1  
14 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to PLAINTIFF, who therefore sues each such  
15 Defendant by said fictitious names. Each of the DEFENDANTS designated herein as a DOE is  
16 legally responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. PLAINTIFF will seek leave of Court to  
17 amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Doe Defendants when such  
18 identities become known.

19 10. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes that, at all relevant times, each  
20 Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, joint employer, officer, director,  
21 controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or  
22 predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of  
23 the other defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all  
24 of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged in this  
25 complaint. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant  
26 acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, and that at all relevant  
27 times, each Defendant knew or should have known about, authorized, ratified, adopted, approved,

28 <sup>1</sup> See <https://grecoentertainmentgroup.com/about-us>. Last visited on January 9, 2023.

1 controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

2 **JOINT LIABILITY**

3 11. Under California law, the definition of the terms “to employ” are broadly construed  
4 under the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) to have three alternative definitions, including: (1) to  
5 exercise control over the wages, hours or working conditions; (2) to suffer of permit to work; or (3)  
6 to engage, thereby creating a common law employment relationship. See, *Martinez v. Combs*, 49  
7 Cal.4th 35, 64 (2010). One reason that the IWC defined “employer” in terms of exercising control  
8 was to reach situations in which multiple entities control different aspects of the employment  
9 relationship. Supervision of the work, in the specific sense of exercising control over how services  
10 are properly performed, is properly viewed as one of the “working conditions” mentioned in the  
11 wage order. *Id.* at 76. A joint employer relationship exists, for example, when one entity (such as a  
12 temporary employment agency) hires and pays a worker, and the other entity supervises the work.  
13 *Id.* Moreover, the California Court of Appeal recently broadened the test for joint employment in  
14 California, applying a less stringent standard to what constitutes sufficient control by a business  
15 over its vendor’s employees’ wages and working conditions to render that business liable as a joint  
16 employer. See, *Medina v. Equilon Enterprises, LLC*, 68 Cal. App. 5th 868 (2021); “[i]f the putative  
17 joint employer instead exercises enough control over the intermediary entity to *indirectly* dictate the  
18 wages, hours, or working conditions of the employee, that is a sufficient showing of joint  
19 employment,” *Id.* at 875 [emphasis added].

20 12. During PLAINTIFF’s employment by DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFF and the  
21 Aggrieved Employees (defined below) were jointly employed by DEFENDANTS for purposes of  
22 the Wage Orders, under the alternative definitions of “to employ” adopted by the California  
23 Supreme Court in *Martinez*, supra. As discussed below, these DEFENDANTS (1) exercised control  
24 over wages, hours and working conditions of PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees; (2)  
25 suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees to work for them; and (3) engaged  
26 PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees to work for them.

27 13. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all relevant times  
28 DEFENDANTS operated as a single integrated enterprise with common ownership and centralized

1 human resources. As a result, DEFENDANTS utilized the same unlawful policies and practices  
2 across all of their locations/facilities and subjected all of the Aggrieved Employees to these same  
3 policies and practices regardless of the location(s) where they worked. Among other things,  
4 PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that: (1) there is common ownership in, and financial control,  
5 in DEFENDANTS' companies, (2) DEFENDANTS utilize common management, who have control  
6 over the day-to-day operations and employment matters, including the power to hire and fire, set  
7 schedules, issue employee policies, and determine rates of compensation across its locations in  
8 California; (3) DEFENDANTS utilize the same policies and procedures for all California  
9 employees, including issuing the same employee handbooks and other form agreements; (4)  
10 DEFENDANTS use at least some of the same Human Resources personnel and attorneys to oversee  
11 employment matters; and, (6) DEFENDANTS share employees.

12       14. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all times relevant  
13 to this Complaint, DEFENDANTS were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved  
14 Employees upon whose behalf PLAINTIFF brings these allegations and causes of action, in that  
15 DEFENDANTS, exercised sufficient control over PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees'  
16 wages, hours and working conditions, and/or suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved  
17 Employees to work so as to be considered the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved  
18 Employees. For example, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, maintain the same California  
19 individual registered agent for service (Charles Lew). Moreover, Defendant 2454 WILSHIRE  
20 RESTAURANT LLC's principal place of business as provided to the California Secretary of State  
21 is located at 2454 Wilshire Blvd., Santa Monica, CA 90403, which is the address for  
22 DEFENDANTS' restaurant operating under the name, Fia, and the location to which PLAINTIFF  
23 regularly reported to work for DEFENDANTS. Defendant 2460 WILSHIRE RESTAURANT  
24 LLC's principal place of business as provided to the California Secretary of State is 2460 Wilshire  
25 Blvd., Santa Monica, CA 90403, which is address for DEFENDANTS' restaurant operating under  
26 the name, Dono. Moreover, Defendant GRECO ENTERTAINMENT GROUP, INC.'s website  
27 identifies the following restaurants as venues within their portfolio: Dono, Fia, and Fia Steak.

28       15. As such, PLAINTIFF alleges that DEFENDANTS created a uniform set of policies,

1 practices and/or procedures concerning, inter alia, hourly and overtime pay, time-keeping practices,  
2 meal and rest periods, reimbursement of business expenses and other working conditions that were  
3 distributed to, and/or applied to PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees, and further that  
4 DEFENDANTS uniformly compensated and controlled the wages of PLAINTIFF and the  
5 Aggrieved Employees in a uniform manner. DEFENDANTS collectively represented to  
6 PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees that each was an "at-will" employee of DEFENDANTS,  
7 and that DEFENDANTS collectively retained the right to terminate PLAINTIFF's and Aggrieved  
8 Employees' employment with or without cause. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS  
9 further collectively represented to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees in writing the details of  
10 their compensation, and the manner in which they were to take meal and rest periods, the procedures  
11 required by DEFENDANTS collectively for recordation of hours worked and the policies applicable  
12 to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees by which DEFENDANTS collectively would evaluate  
13 the wage rates of PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees.

14         16. Thus, DEFENDANTS collectively exercised the right to control the wages, hours  
15 and working conditions of PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees. As such, DEFENDANTS  
16 collectively held the right to control virtually every aspect of PLAINTIFF's and the Aggrieved  
17 Employees' employment, including the instrumentality that resulted in the illegal conduct for which  
18 PLAINTIFF seeks relief in this Complaint.

19         17. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that DEFENDANTS exercised the same  
20 control over, applied the same policies and practices, and engaged in the same acts and omissions  
21 with regard to the other Aggrieved Employees.

### 22                                   **PAGA ALLEGATIONS**

23         18. PLAINTIFF brings this action under the PAGA, as a representative action on behalf  
24 of the State of California and Aggrieved Employees, regarding violations of the California Labor  
25 Code as set forth herein as to all Aggrieved Employees. "Aggrieved Employees" include:

26             All individuals who currently work or formerly worked for any of the DEFENDANTS at  
27             any facility/location owned, operated and/or managed by any of the DEFENDANTS in  
28             California at any time from one year plus 65 days from the filing of the initial Complaint

1 through the present (“PAGA Period”).

2 19. PLAINTIFF and other individuals that currently work or formerly worked for  
3 DEFENDANTS are each an “aggrieved employee,” as that term is defined under Labor Code section  
4 2699(c), as they were each employed by DEFENDANTS during the applicable statutory limitations  
5 period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code violations set forth herein. Accordingly,  
6 PLAINTIFF seeks to recover on behalf of the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees, the  
7 civil penalties provided by PAGA, plus reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

8 20. PLAINTIFF has standing to bring a PAGA cause of action on behalf of the State and  
9 all Aggrieved Employees, as he was jointly employed by DEFENDANTS and is thereby affected  
10 by one or more of the alleged violations. *See Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018)  
11 23 Cal.App.5th 745, 757. A PAGA plaintiff has authority to seek penalties for all known violations  
12 committed by the employer – regardless of whether Plaintiff experienced all violations personally.  
13 *Id.* at 760-761.

14 **COMPLIANCE WITH PAGA’S NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

15 21. On November 4, 2022, PLAINTIFF, through counsel, gave written notice by online  
16 filing with the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) informing it that  
17 DEFENDANTS failed to comply with California’s labor laws with regard to the allegations alleged  
18 in this Complaint (“PAGA Notice”). The LWDA assigned PLAINTIFF the following case number:  
19 LWDA-CM-917860-22. PLAINTIFF’s PAGA Notice, a true and correct copy of which is attached  
20 hereto as **Exhibit 1**, was also sent to DEFENDANTS via certified mail.

21 22. PLAINTIFF’s PAGA Notice outlined DEFENDANTS' violations of the California  
22 Labor Code and the applicable wage orders on behalf of the State of California and other Aggrieved  
23 Employees.

24 23. The LWDA did not provide notice of its intention to investigate DEFENDANTS’  
25 violations after expiration of the 65-day waiting time period, or at any time. To the extent any of the  
26 alleged violations were curable, DEFENDANTS failed to cure within the time allotted by PAGA.  
27 PLAINTIFF has exhausted the administrative remedies as required by Labor Code section 2699.3.  
28 Consequently, PLAINTIFF’s right to file the instant lawsuit has duly accrued.

24. PLAINTIFF seeks to recover the PAGA civil penalties through a representative action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. Therefore, class certification of the PAGA claims is not required.

## FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

25. During the PAGA Period, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were employed by DEFENDANTS in the State of California. At all relevant times referenced herein, DEFENDANTS exercised control over PLAINTIFF and the other Aggrieved Employees and suffered and/or permitted them to work.

26. PLAINTIFF is currently employed by DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt employee. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS as a cook and/or similar title at DEFENDANTS' restaurant/venue located at 2454 Wilshire Blvd Santa Monica, CA 90403, operating under the name Fia, from in or around mid-October 2021 through the present. PLAINTIFF regularly worked at least eight (8) to nine (9) hours per day, at least five (5) days per week.

27. At all relevant times, PLAINTIFF was a non-exempt employee that was paid on an hourly basis for time counted by DEFENDANTS as hours worked.

28. **Unpaid Minimum and Overtime Wages.** DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, resulting in the underpayment of minimum and overtime wages. DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked by virtue of, DEFENDANTS' automatic deduction and time rounding policies, and failure to relieve employees of all duties/employer control during unpaid meal periods or otherwise unlawful practices for missed or improper meal periods, as explained below.

29. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding meal period start and end times and/or automatically deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for meal periods, despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were subject to DEFENDANTS' control during purported meal periods and/or were otherwise not afforded lawful meal periods, depriving PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees of all wages owed.

1           30.     Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were not paid for all hours  
2 worked due to DEFENDANTS' policy and/or practice of rounding time entries or paying according  
3 to scheduled hours worked instead of actual time worked, and/or mandated off-the clock work  
4 policies and/or practices.

5           31.     For example, as explained below, PLAINTIFF was consistently required to work  
6 through his purported meal periods due to the need to assist customers, complete orders, cook/prep  
7 food and/or complete other work tasks, yet DEFENDANTS deducted at least thirty minutes per shift  
8 as though a thirty-minute off-duty meal period had been taken when it had not, resulting in at least  
9 several hours of off-the-clock work per week and the significant underpayment of wages owed to  
10 PLAINTIFF. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had and continues to have a uniform  
11 policy and practice of clocking out other Aggrieved Employees and/or requiring other Aggrieved  
12 Employees to clock out for meal periods that were not taken, worked through and/or on duty,  
13 resulting in consistent off-the-clock work and the underpayment of minimum wages owed to  
14 Aggrieved Employees, among other violations of the labor code described herein. Based on  
15 information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not compensate Aggrieved Employees for time spent  
16 donning and doffing personal protective equipment and/or uniforms/work clothing (e.g., gloves,  
17 protective eyewear, hairnets, hats, and/or face masks) during meal periods, before the start of a  
18 scheduled shift, and/or after completing a scheduled shift, resulting in off-the-clock work and the  
19 underpayment of wages owed to Aggrieved Employees.

20           32.     Additionally, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were required to perform  
21 other off-the-clock work for which they were not compensated. For example, at times,  
22 DEFENDANTS' electronic/computer employee time-keeping system malfunctioned such that  
23 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were required to either reinitiate and/or otherwise  
24 troubleshoot the system prior to being able to clock in and/or were unable to clock in at all for the  
25 start of their shifts and/or clock back in from meal periods, resulting in off-the-clock work and the  
26 underpayment of wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees. Based on  
27 information and belief, Aggrieved Employees experienced the same issues when clocking out for  
28 shifts and/or back in for meal periods. This time spent under DEFENDANTS' control was not

1 recorded and not compensated and resulted in unpaid minimum wages owed to Aggrieved  
2 Employees.

3       33. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were also pressured to  
4 complete at least some of their work tasks off-the-clock in order to meet DEFENDANTS' goals and  
5 expectations. For example, based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were also  
6 required to complete off-the-clock work outside of scheduled shifts due to work-related phone calls  
7 and/or messages they received to their personal phones and were required to respond to, including  
8 but not limited to, communications from supervisors regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks,  
9 resulting in the underpayment of wages owed to Aggrieved Employees. Moreover, based on  
10 information and belief, Aggrieved Employees who opened their work locations were required to  
11 first unlock the doors, turn on all the lights in the restaurant/facility and/or deactivate the alarm  
12 before clocking in for work, resulting in pre-shift off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages  
13 owed to Aggrieved Employees. Based on further information and belief, Aggrieved Employees in  
14 charge of closing their location(s) were required to first clock out for their shifts before enabling the  
15 alarm, turning off all the lights in the facility and/or locking the doors. This resulted in additional  
16 off-the-clock post-shift work that was not compensated and the underpayment of wages owed to  
17 Aggrieved Employees.

18       34. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay Aggrieved  
19 Employees for time they were required to spend completing orientation, policy questionnaires,  
20 and/or time spent completing the onboarding process including but not limited to reviewing various  
21 documents and policies provided by DEFENDANTS. Based on information and belief, this work  
22 time was completed off-the-clock and was not compensated.

23       35. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented a time-  
24 rounding system that as applied systematically deprived PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved  
25 Employees of compensable time because the time-rounding system implemented by  
26 DEFENDANTS would almost always, if not always, result in understating actual compensable work  
27 time. DEFENDANTS' failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of its time-rounding practices  
28 resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees

1 as well as unpaid overtime wages for those Aggrieved Employees who worked more than eight (8)  
2 hours in a day and/or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

3 36. DEFENDANTS' failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of its time rounding,  
4 auto-deduction policies and practices for unlawful meal periods, failure to provide lawful meal  
5 periods, and/or other off-the-clock work practices and policies, resulted in the underpayment of  
6 minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees as well as unpaid overtime wages  
7 for PLAINTIFF and those Aggrieved Employees who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day  
8 and/or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

9 37. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive  
10 knowledge that its time rounding policies/practices, auto-deduction policies and practices, failure to  
11 provide lawful meal periods (as described below) and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in the  
12 underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees, in  
13 violation of California's minimum and overtime wage laws.

14 38. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to pay  
15 Aggrieved Employees two times their regular rate of pay for time worked beyond twelve (12) hours  
16 per workday and for time worked beyond eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in  
17 a work week, in violation of California's overtime laws.

18 39. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all non-  
19 discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, shift differential pay, multiple base rates  
20 of pay, bonus pay, and/or other non-discretionary pay into the regular rate of pay used to calculate  
21 the owed overtime rate(s), resulting in the miscalculation and underpayment of overtime wages  
22 owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees.

23 40. **Meal Period Violations.** PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees consistently  
24 worked shifts of at least five and one-half hours or more, entitling them to at least one meal period.  
25 However, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees would not receive legally compliant thirty  
26 (30) minute first and second meal periods. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees  
27 were consistently unable to take timely, off duty, thirty-minute, uninterrupted meal periods, often  
28 being forced to take late meal periods, interrupted meal periods, and/or work through part or all their

1 meal periods due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties and/or commentary  
2 from supervisors pressuring them to take non-compliant meal periods or skip meal periods  
3 completely. For example, PLAINTIFF was consistently forced to take her meal period late (i.e. after  
4 the end of the fifth hour of work) or not take a meal period at all due to understaffing and/or lack of  
5 coverage/relief workers available. Oftentimes, PLAINTIFF's supervisor instructed PLAINTIFF to  
6 continue working and take her meal period late when it was not so busy. Other times, PLAINTIFF's  
7 supervisor instructed PLAINTIFF to clock out for her meal period but to continue working. For  
8 example, PLAINTIFF was consistently required to work through his owed meal periods completely  
9 due to the need to assist customers, complete orders, cook/prep food and/or complete other work  
10 tasks, yet DEFENDANTS would deduct at least thirty minutes per shift as though a thirty-minute  
11 off-duty meal period had been taken when it had not.

12 41. Based on information and belief, other Aggrieved Employees were consistently  
13 suffered and permitted to take meal periods past the fifth hour of work and/or had their meal periods  
14 interrupted, cut short, restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises and/or otherwise on duty due to  
15 commentary from supervisors, understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or  
16 the need to meet DEFENDANTS' goals and expectations.

17 42. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or  
18 practices that failed to relieve Aggrieved Employees of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control  
19 during unpaid meal periods.

20 43. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to  
21 complete off-the-clock work prior to their scheduled shift time which DEFENDANTS failed to take  
22 into account when scheduling meal periods for Aggrieved Employees. Based on information and  
23 belief, meal periods were late, in part due to unaccounted pre-shift off-the-clock work.

24 44. Based on information and belief, despite DEFENDANTS' failure to provide lawful  
25 meal periods, DEFENDANTS implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding the start and end  
26 times of PLAINTIFF's and other Aggrieved Employees' meal periods and/or automatically  
27 deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for missed and/or otherwise unlawful meal periods despite  
28 having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees did

1 not receive lawful meal periods.

2 45. Moreover, per DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice, Aggrieved Employees  
3 who worked shifts of more than ten hours did not receive a second legally compliant thirty (30)  
4 minute second meal period.

5 46. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to instruct PLAINTIFF and  
6 other Aggrieved Employees as to the timing and duty-free nature of meal periods. Based on further  
7 information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not have a compliant written meal period policy, nor  
8 did DEFENDANTS have any sort of compliant policy in practice.

9 47. Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to keep accurate  
10 records of the true start and end times of PLAINTIFF's and Aggrieved Employees' meal periods.  
11 Based on information and belief, to the extent meal period were recorded, DEFENDANTS illegally  
12 rounded the start and end times of purported meal periods resulting in PLAINTIFF and other  
13 Aggrieved Employees not being paid for all time worked as well as late and/or shortened meal  
14 periods. *See Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58.

15 48. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive  
16 knowledge that its policies and practices resulted in the denial of uninterrupted meal periods which  
17 were free of DEFENDANTS' control owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees, in  
18 violation of California's meal period laws.

19 49. DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees, an  
20 additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of compensation for each workday a lawful  
21 meal period was not provided. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a meal period premium at all for  
22 each workday a lawful meal period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper meal period  
23 premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to,  
24 bonuses/incentive pay, multiple base rates of pay, shift differential pay and/or other non-  
25 discretionary compensation into the regular rate or compensation for purposes of calculating the  
26 owed meal period premium.

27 50. **Rest Period Violations.** DEFENDANTS did not properly authorize and provide  
28 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant rest periods at a rate of every

1 four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, that insofar as practicable, are provided in the  
2 middle of the work period, as required by law.

3 51. PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were not adequately informed,  
4 authorized, instructed about, nor permitted an opportunity to take proper rest periods per California  
5 law. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had no policy in place nor instruction as to  
6 the taking of duty-free rest periods.

7 52. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not have a have a compliant  
8 written rest period policy, nor did DEFENDANTS have any sort of compliant rest period policy in  
9 practice. .

10 53. For example, PLAINTIFF was consistently required to work through his owed rest  
11 periods due to the need to assist customers, complete orders, cook/prep food and/or complete other  
12 work tasks. Oftentimes, PLAINTIFF was only able to take a single rest period per shift and that  
13 single rest period was usually not a full net ten minutes, was on duty, and/or otherwise noncompliant  
14 with California rest period law.

15 54. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees' rest periods were  
16 interrupted, cut short, on duty, restricted to work premises and/or late due to understaffing, the nature  
17 and constraints of their job duties, and/or due to commentary from supervisors/managers pressuring  
18 them to skip rest periods completely or otherwise take non-compliant rest periods.

19 55. Moreover, DEFENDANTS failed to provide any form of a third rest period on shifts  
20 lasting longer than ten hours.

21 56. For example, based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees who work  
22 shifts lasting longer than ten (10) hours do not receive any version of a third rest period on those  
23 shifts lasting more than ten hours.

24 57. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or  
25 practices that failed to relieve PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees of all duties and  
26 DEFENDANTS' control during rest periods.

27 58. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were pressured to complete  
28 their work duties according to a designated schedule such that rest periods were only taken once

1 tasks were completed, and/or as time permitted.

2 59. Furthermore, DEFENDANTS failed to pay a rest period premium for each day in  
3 which PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees experienced a missed/unlawful rest period in  
4 violation of California law. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a rest period premium at all for each  
5 workday a proper rest period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper rest period premium  
6 for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to,  
7 bonuses/incentive pay, multiple base rates of pay, shift differential pay, and/or other non-  
8 discretionary compensation into the regular rate of compensation for purposes of calculating the  
9 owed rest period premium.

10 60. **Inaccurate Wage Statements.** During the relevant period, DEFENDANTS failed to  
11 provide PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate wage statements that complied  
12 with Labor Code section 226. As DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved  
13 Employees with meal and rest periods that complied with Labor section 226.7, the wage statements  
14 DEFENDANTS issued to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees failed and continue to fail to  
15 correctly set forth the gross wages earned, the total hours worked, the net wages earned, and all  
16 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours  
17 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

18 61. DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees  
19 that also failed to indicate the earned gross and net wages earned during the pay period, the correct  
20 applicable rates of pay for all hours worked, and the total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and  
21 Aggrieved Employees (by virtue of rounded time entries, automatic deduction for meal  
22 periods/failure to relieve Aggrieved Employees of all duties and employer control during unpaid  
23 meal periods, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather than actual hours worked, and/or  
24 other off-the-clock work policies and practices) which results in a violation of Labor Code section  
25 226(a).

26 62. As described herein, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed to  
27 incorporate all forms of non-discretionary compensation earned during the pay period into the  
28 overtime pay rate calculation, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour

1 of overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees.

2 63. Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed  
3 to list the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the Class Member is being paid.

4 64. Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements  
5 to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees that further violate Labor Code section 226(a), by among  
6 other things, failing to list the correct name and/or address of the legal entity that is the employer.

7 65. As a result, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved  
8 Employees that were not accurate and did not include all of the statutorily required information. As  
9 such, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 226.

10 66. **Failure to Produce Employment Records.** Based on information and belief,  
11 DEFENDANTS have a uniform policy and practice of failing to produce or make available a current  
12 or former employee's time, pay, and/or personnel records when requested pursuant to Labor Code  
13 sections 226, 1198.5, 432, and/or the applicable Wage Order. For example, on December 29, 2021,  
14 PLAINTIFF, through counsel, sent a written request for time, pay and personnel records to  
15 DEFENDANTS. On February 16, 2022, PLAINTIFF, through counsel, sent a second written  
16 request for time, pay and personnel records. Yet, DEFENDANTS failed to produce any records at  
17 all within the time periods delineated by California labor law. To this day, DEFENDANTS have not  
18 produced PLAINTIFF's requested records. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed  
19 and continue to fail to timely produce complete time, pay, and personnel records when requested by  
20 other Aggrieved Employees.

21 67. **Failure to Timely Pay All Wages Upon Separation of Employment.** Based on  
22 information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees all wages that  
23 were due and owing upon termination or resignation. Based on information and belief,  
24 DEFENDANTS untimely provide final wages to Aggrieved Employees without regard to the timing  
25 requirements of Labor Code sections 201-202.

26 68. Upon separation of employment, Aggrieved Employees' final paychecks were not  
27 timely provided and/or were not timely provided with all owed vacation pay and/or paid time off.  
28 Moreover, Aggrieved Employees' final paychecks, once provided, did not include all wages owed

1 as they were devoid of, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages,  
2 premium wages, vacation pay, and all owed sick leave and/or paid time off wages at the properly  
3 accrued rates.

4 69. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code section  
5 203, 210, and/or 256.

6 70. **Unreimbursed Business Expenses.** Based on information and belief,  
7 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees to incur business expenses as a  
8 direct consequence of the performance of their job duties without providing reimbursement, in  
9 violation of Labor Code section 2802. Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved  
10 Employees were improperly required to provide and maintain work tools that are supposed to be the  
11 responsibility of the employer.

12 71. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS shifted the costs of doing business  
13 onto Aggrieved Employees by requiring them to pay for business expenses, including but not limited  
14 to, uniforms/work clothing/safety/protective equipment and/or the use of Aggrieved Employees'  
15 personal mobile phone and data usage for work-related purposes including but not limited to  
16 receiving and responding to work related messages and/or phone calls. For example, based on  
17 information and belief, at times, Aggrieved Employees received calls/messages to their personal  
18 cell phones/mobile devices from supervisors regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks but were  
19 not provided any reimbursement from DEFENDANTS for this personal cell phone use.  
20 Additionally, PLAINTIFF was required to purchase and/or maintain his own work  
21 clothing/uniforms and/or work shoes, such as, but not limited to, pants and shirts, without being  
22 provided any reimbursement from DEFENDANTS for the expenses he incurred in connection  
23 therewith. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to reimburse and  
24 indemnify Aggrieved Employees for business expenses. Pursuant to California Labor Code section  
25 2802, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be reimbursed for all reasonable  
26 expenses associated with carrying out DEFENDANTS' orders and/or carrying out the duties  
27 assigned by DEFENDANTS.

28 72. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to reimburse and

1 indemnify Aggrieved Employees for business expenses. Pursuant to California Labor Code section  
2 2802, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be reimbursed for all reasonable  
3 expenses associated with carrying out DEFENDANTS' orders and/or carrying out the duties  
4 assigned by DEFENDANTS.

5 73. DEFENDANTS' failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with full reimbursement  
6 for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required that Aggrieved  
7 Employees subsidize and/or carry the burden of business expenses in violation of Labor Code section  
8 2802.

9 74. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and alleges thereon that DEFENDANTS  
10 engaged in these same herein described unlawful practices and that DEFENDANTS applied these  
11 same herein described unlawful practices to all of its employees that it applied to PLAINTIFF.

12 75. **Inaccurate Records.** Based on the above-described unlawful policies and practices,  
13 DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail, to keep accurate and complete payroll records as  
14 required by Labor Code sections 1174, 1198, 1199, and section 7 of all applicable Wage Orders.  
15 DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to keep accurate and complete payroll records as  
16 required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked,  
17 applicable rates of pay, time records showing when PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees  
18 began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and accurate itemized wage  
19 statements.

20 76. DEFENDANTS have failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete  
21 records showing total hours worked by virtue of DEFENDANTS' time rounding, automatic meal  
22 period deductions, failure to relieve PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees of all duties and  
23 employer control during unpaid meal periods, failure to record the true start and end times of meal  
24 periods, shift start times and shift end times, and other off-the-clock work policies and practices  
25 described herein.

26 77. **Sick Leave Violations.** Throughout the relevant time period, DEFENDANTS failed  
27 to provide proper paid sick leave to Aggrieved Employees. DEFENDANTS either failed to provide  
28 paid sick leave at all or improperly calculated the sick leave accrual and the sick leave rate of pay

1 owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees by failing to base the accrued sick leave hours  
2 on the correct number of hours worked (as a result of the rounding/automatic deduction policies and  
3 practices for meal periods and/or shift start and end times/other required off-the-clock work  
4 including but not limited to unpaid meal periods) and by failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay  
5 and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, non-discretionary  
6 bonuses/incentive pay, shift differential pay multiple base rates of pay and/or other non-  
7 discretionary compensation into the sick leave pay rate calculation.

8         78. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed to place Aggrieved  
9 Employees on notice of their paid sick leave rights – or thereby putting their entitlement to sick  
10 leave in a Labor Code section 2810.5 notice. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS  
11 failed to provide notice of the correct sick leave amount balance available to Aggrieved Employees  
12 on their wage statements or other written statement. Moreover, based on information and belief,  
13 DEFENDANTS failed to maintain accurate records of used sick leave and the balance of paid sick  
14 leave.

15         79. Based on information and belief, throughout the relevant time period,  
16 DEFENDANTS failed to provide notice of the balance of sick leave pay left for Aggrieved  
17 Employees, thus affecting their intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave. But for this failure,  
18 Aggrieved Employees would have used their paid sick leave at least prior to their respective  
19 separations, for as on several occasions thereafter, he or she would have been entitled to use the  
20 banked sick leave and earn appropriate compensation.

21         80. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to comply  
22 with Labor Code section 246, by failing to provide Aggrieved Employees with a Labor Code section  
23 226 wage statement, or separate writing containing the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid  
24 time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays wages.

25         81. As such, DEFENDANTS have violated California's paid sick leave laws and  
26 unlawfully retained and continue to retain paid sick leave that should have been paid and was not as  
27 a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to properly institute a lawful paid sick leave program. These  
28 unlawful practices and policies violate Labor Code sections 245-248.5.

1           82.     **Failure To Provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave.** Labor Code § 248.2 provides  
2 that all employers with 26 or more employees are required to provide up to 80 hours for covered  
3 employees to take 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave to care for themselves, to care  
4 for a family member or if it is vaccine-related. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS  
5 violated Labor Code § 248.2 by not providing Aggrieved Employees with required 2021 COVID-  
6 19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to  
7 provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave in 2022 in violation of Labor Code section 248.6.

8           83.     **Refusal to Make Payment.** DEFENDANTS violated and continue to violate Labor  
9 Code section 216 by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at  
10 the proper wage rate and by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees an additional  
11 hour of pay for each meal/rest period not provided or that was otherwise unlawful. *Gould v.*  
12 *Maryland Sound Industries, Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1154-1155.

13           84.     **Statutory Wage Violations.** As described above, DEFENDANTS willfully and  
14 systematically denied PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees minimum and overtime wages  
15 for all hours worked which resulted in the payment of less than the statutorily required wages owed  
16 to them. DEFENDANTS acted with the intent to deprive them of statutory wages, including, but  
17 not limited to, overtime wages and minimum wages, to which they were entitled to under California  
18 law. Thus, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 223 by paying PLAINTIFF and other  
19 Aggrieved Employees lower wages than those they were entitled to while purporting that  
20 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were properly paid.

21           85.     **Failure to Provide Suitable Resting Facilities.** DEFENDANTS'  
22 restaurants/locations are generally similar in layout and design, and there was, and continues to be,  
23 space that allows for a resting facility that employees may use to cease work and recover during  
24 meal or rest periods. DEFENDANTS could have provided PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees  
25 with a resting facility within the restaurant with reasonable or no modification. Based on information  
26 and belief, DEFENDANTS denied and continue to deny, employees with suitable areas to rest (e.g.  
27 a breakroom). As a result, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were forced to adjust to  
28 areas not conducive to resting, or search for facilities outside of the restaurant.

1           86.     **Seating Violations:** Per section 14(A-B) of all applicable IWC Wage Orders,  
2 employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the  
3 use of seats and when they are not actively engaged in the work duties that would not permit them  
4 to be seated.

5           87.     All applicable IWC Wage Orders, Section 14(A-B) provides:

6           (A)    All working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the  
7 work reasonably permits the use of seats.

8           (B)    When employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the  
9 nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in  
10 reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it  
11 does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

12          88.     Suitable seating is one of the worker protections covered by California's Wage  
13 Orders, which have the same dignity as statutes, are remedial in nature and are to be broadly  
14 construed to effectuate the goal of protecting the comfort and welfare of employees. Brinker  
15 Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1027 (2012).

16          89.     Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and  
17 other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seating, and when such employees were not engaged in  
18 duties which required them to stand, no seating was placed in reasonable proximity to their  
19 workstations.

20          90.     Moreover, based on information and belief, the nature of the work reasonably  
21 permitted the use of seats for at least part of the time that PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved  
22 Employees were working. Lastly, there were periods of time when PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved  
23 Employees were not engaged in active duties of their employment, yet there were no suitable seats  
24 in reasonable proximity to the work area and use of seats would not interfere with the performance  
25 of their duties.

26          91.     The Aggrieved Employees worked in various positions. The nature of PLAINTIFF's  
27 and other Aggrieved Employees' work reasonably permitted the use of seats. However,  
28 DEFENDANTS failed to provide suitable seating in reasonable proximity to Aggrieved Employees'

1 work areas in violation of section 14(A-B) of all applicable Wage Orders, and Labor Code sections  
2 1198 and 1199, subjecting DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1199 and  
3 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and IWC Wage Order provision, for each  
4 Aggrieved Employee, results in a separate civil penalty.

5 92. **Standard Conditions of Labor Violations.** DEFENDANTS' unlawful policies and  
6 practices described herein also resulted in violations of Labor Code Sections 1198 and 1199, which  
7 together, make it unlawful to employ individuals under conditions that are prohibited by the Wage  
8 Orders or any provision within Part 4, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code, including section 1174, 1197,  
9 and 1198, or order or ruling of the commission.

10 93. Therefore, DEFENDANTS' violations with respect to, including but not limited to,  
11 meal periods, rest periods, recordkeeping provisions, minimum wages and overtime wages, seating,  
12 suitable resting facilities, and unreimbursed business expenses result in separate violations of  
13 sections 1198 and 1199.

14 94. **Failure to Pay Vested Vacation/Paid Time Off:** Based on information and belief,  
15 DEFENDANTS have and continue to have a uniform policy and practice of failing to allow  
16 Aggrieved Employees to use their earned vacation/paid time off during their employment and/or  
17 failing to pay all vested, accrued paid time off to Aggrieved Employees upon separation of  
18 employment, in violation of California law, including but not limited to, Labor Code section 227.3.

19 95. **Violation of Labor Code sections 351-353:** Labor Code Section 351 prohibits  
20 employers and their agents from sharing in or keeping any portion of a gratuity left for or given to  
21 one or more employees by a patron. Furthermore, it is illegal for employers to make wage  
22 deductions from gratuities, or from using gratuities as direct or indirect credits against an employee's  
23 wages. Labor Code Section 353 mandates employers keep accurate records of all gratuities  
24 received.

25 96. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to ensure that Aggrieved  
26 Employee fully received the gratuities left for them by patrons, in that DEFENDANTS and their  
27 agents would collect and/or take a portion of the gratuities for themselves, in violation of Labor  
28 Code Section 351. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed/fails to keep

1 accurate records of all tips received, in violation of Labor Code Section 353.

2 97. Pursuant to PAGA, DEFENDANTS are liable for penalties of \$100 per pay period  
3 payable to each Aggrieved Employee for the first violation of Labor Code Section 351 and 353 they  
4 experienced within the statutory period, and \$200 per pay period for each additional violation.

5 98. **Unlawful Agreements-Unlawful Criminal History Inquiries.**

6 Unlawful Financial and Criminal Background Checks.

7 99. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to  
8 agree in writing to unlawful conditions of employment including but not limited to unlawful  
9 criminal and/or financial checks and/or unlawful non-compete/non solicitation agreements as a  
10 condition of obtaining and/or continuing employment in violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

11 100. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS ordered unlawful financial credit  
12 checks on Aggrieved Employees, in violation of Labor Code section 1024.5, and required Aggrieved  
13 Employees to provide ongoing written consent to the unlawful credit checks as a condition of  
14 employment, in violation of California and Federal law, which results in a further violation of Labor  
15 Code section 432.5.

16 101. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also required Aggrieved  
17 Employees to submit and/or agree to submit in writing to unlawful criminal background checks as  
18 a condition of obtaining and/or holding employment in violation of the Investigative Consumer  
19 Reporting Agencies Act (ICRAA- CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq.*) and the Fair Credit  
20 Reporting Act (FCRA - 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.*)

21 102. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to  
22 agree in writing to a background check which failed to abide by the requirements set forth in CA  
23 Civil Code section 1786, *et seq.* and 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.*, including but not limited to by  
24 failing to provide a clear and conspicuous disclosure (and/or failing to provide any disclosure at all),  
25 failing to provide disclosures free of extraneous information, failing to provide a lawful purpose for  
26 the background check, failing to provide a summary of rights under the ICRAA and/or the FCRA,  
27 failing to provide a way by which the individual could request a copy of the report, failing to disclose  
28 the name, address, and telephone number of the third party preparing the report, and failing to

1 properly obtain authorization or consent to such a background check, and thus was an unlawful  
2 background check.

3 103. By requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to unlawful criminal and/or  
4 financial checks not in conformance with the applicable laws, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code  
5 section 432.5.

6 104. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS also required Aggrieved  
7 Employees to agree in writing to provide ongoing consent to DEFENDANTS to conduct  
8 background checks throughout the duration of employment, in violation of the ICRAA and/or FCRA  
9 and/or other applicable laws, resulting in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5, by  
10 requiring applicants and employees to agree to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment.

11 105. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS knew that requiring  
12 Aggrieved Employees to agree to unlawful criminal and/or financial background checks as a  
13 condition of obtaining and/or holding employment was unlawful.

14 106. By requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to unlawful provisions as a  
15 condition of employment, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5.

16 Unlawful Inquires into Criminal History

17 107. Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits an employer from asking applicants about past  
18 arrest(s) unless they resulted in conviction(s) and even then, certain limitations apply. Based on  
19 information and belief, DEFENDANTS asked Aggrieved Employees about arrests not resulting in  
20 convictions on its employment application, in violation of California law.

21 108. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in violation of California law,  
22 including but not limited to the Fair Chance Act/the California Fair Employment and Housing Act  
23 (“FEHA”), asked Aggrieved Employees about convictions prior to extending an offer of  
24 employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired into criminal history on its employment  
25 application in violation of California law, and in violation of Labor code section 432.5.

26 109. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and alleges thereon that DEFENDANTS  
27 engaged in these same herein described unlawful practices, which led to violations of the California  
28 Labor Code as further alleged below, and that DEFENDANTS applied these same herein described

1 unlawful practices to all of its employees that it applied to PLAINTIFF.

2 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
3 **VIOLATION OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, LABOR CODE SECTIONS**  
4 **2698, *ET SEQ.***

5 **(On behalf of Plaintiff, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California against all**  
6 **Defendants)**

7 110. PLAINTIFF incorporates all preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

8 **Failure to Keep Accurate Records**

9 111. California Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep “accurate and complete”  
10 payroll records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by all non-exempt employees.  
11 All applicable Wage Orders § 7 similarly requires employers to keep time records reflecting the  
12 times during which all owed meal periods were provided each day.

13 112. At all relevant times, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to keep accurate  
14 and complete records as required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total  
15 daily hours worked, applicable rates of pay, time records showing when PLAINTIFF and other  
16 Aggrieved Employees began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and  
17 accurate itemized wage statements.

18 113. DEFENDANTS’ failure to keep “accurate and complete” payroll records for  
19 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees violates Labor Code §§ 1174, 1198, 1199, and all  
20 applicable Wage Orders, section 7. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under  
21 Labor Code §§ 558.1, 226.6, 1174.5 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and  
22 Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay  
23 period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.<sup>2</sup>

24 **Meal Period Violations**

25 114. California law requires employers to provide employees a duty-free, uninterrupted  
26 thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a workday, and

---

27 <sup>2</sup> Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is “for each aggrieved employee per pay period”); Labor  
28 Code § 558 (establishing that the civil penalty is “for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the  
employee was underpaid”); All applicable wage orders, § 20 (establishing that “[i]n addition to any other civil  
penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes  
to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty...for each underpaid employee for each  
pay period during which the employee was underpaid”) (emphasis added).

1 it must be provided within the first five (5) hours the employee works. Lab. Code section 512 (and  
2 all applicable IWC Wage Orders), section 11(A) and (C); *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior*  
3 *Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1004.

4 115. Employers must also provide employees with a second duty-free, uninterrupted thirty  
5 (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than (10) hours in a workday, and it must  
6 be provided before the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> hour of work. *Ibid.* Meal periods can be waived, but only  
7 under the following circumstances: (1) if an employee's total work period in a day is over five (5)  
8 hours but no more than six (6) hours, the required meal period may be waived by mutual consent of  
9 the employer and employee; and (2) if an employee's total work period in a day is over ten (10)  
10 hours but no more than twelve (12) hours, the required second meal period may be waived by mutual  
11 consent of the employer and employee, but only if the first meal period was not waived. *Ibid.*

12 116. Employers covered by any and all applicable IWC Wage Orders have an obligation  
13 to both (1) relieve their employees for at least one meal period for shifts over five hours (see above),  
14 and (2) to record having done so. If the employer fails to properly record a valid meal period, it is  
15 presumed that no meal period was provided. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7(A)(3)  
16 ("Meal periods . . . shall also be recorded"); *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1004, 1052-1053, citing  
17 section 7(A)(3) ("If an employer's records show no meal period for a given shift over five hours, a  
18 rebuttable presumption arises that the employee was not relieved of duty and no meal period was  
19 provided").

20 117. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employees'  
21 regular rate of pay for each missed or unlawful meal period (e.g., less than 30 minutes, interrupted  
22 meal period, first meal period provided after five (5) hours, second meal period provided after 10  
23 hours). Lab. Code § 226.7; all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §11(B) ("If an employer fails to  
24 provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provision of this Order, the  
25 employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation  
26 for each workday that the meal period is not provided"); *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1004.

27 118. As explained above, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were consistently  
28 unable to take timely, off duty, thirty-minute, uninterrupted first and second meal periods, often

1 being forced to take late meal periods, interrupted meal periods, and/or work through part or all of  
2 their meal periods due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or  
3 commentary from supervisors pressuring them to take non-compliant meal periods or skip meal  
4 periods completely.

5 119. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had and continue to have a policy  
6 of rounding the start and end times of employees' meal periods and/or automatically deducting thirty  
7 minutes per shift despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and  
8 Aggrieved Employees did not receive compliant meal periods.

9 120. Moreover, based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees did not receive a  
10 timely, uninterrupted second meal period when working shifts over ten (10) hours in a workday.

11 121. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DEFENDANTS had  
12 actual and/or constructive knowledge that its time-rounding and auto-deduction policies and  
13 practices, other unlawful policies and practices resulted in the denial of compliant meal periods in  
14 violation of California's meal period laws.

15 122. DEFENDANTS also failed to pay premiums for missed/otherwise unlawful meal  
16 periods in violation of California law and/or failed to pay the proper meal period premium for failure  
17 to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration including but not limited to, bonuses/incentive  
18 pay, shift differential pay and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate or  
19 compensation for purposes of calculating the owed meal period premium.

20 123. These unlawful meal period policies and practices result in violations of Labor Code  
21 sections 226.7, 512, and 1198-1199, and all applicable wage orders, § 11. These violations subject  
22 DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 558, 558.1 and 2699, and all applicable  
23 Wage Orders, § 20. These practices result in further violations such as violations of Labor Code §  
24 1174 as discussed above, 1198-1199, 226.6 and other violations discussed below.

25 **Rest Period Violations**

26 124. Labor Code section 226.7 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders require an employer  
27 to authorize or permit an employee to take a rest period of ten (10) net minutes for every four hours  
28 worked or major fraction thereof. Such rest periods must be in the middle of the four-hour period

1 “insofar as practicable.” In *Brinker v. Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1004 (2012),  
2 the California Supreme Court held that employees are entitled to a 10-minute paid rest period for  
3 shifts from 3 ½ to 6 hours in a length, two 10-minute rest periods for shifts more than 6 hours up to  
4 10 hours, and three 10-minute rest periods for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours. (*Id.* at  
5 1029). The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take  
6 off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control  
7 over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5<sup>th</sup>  
8 257. If the employer fails to provide any required rest period, the employer must pay the employee  
9 one hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday the employer did  
10 not provide at least one legally required rest period, pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, and  
11 applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(B).

12 125. PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive legally compliant, timely  
13 10-minute rest periods for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. As explained  
14 above, any purported rest periods were late, interrupted, cut short, on duty, and/or otherwise subject  
15 to DEFENDANTS’ control due to the nature and constraints of Aggrieved Employees’ job duties,  
16 understaffing, and/or commentary from supervisors pressuring PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved  
17 Employees to skip rest periods completely or otherwise take non-compliant rest periods.

18 126. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or  
19 practices that failed to relieve PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees of all duties and  
20 employer control during rest periods. Based on further information and belief, Aggrieved  
21 Employees were pressured to complete their work duties according to a designated schedule such  
22 that rest periods were only taken once tasks were completed, and/or as time permitted.

23 127. As a result, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees did not receive legally compliant  
24 first, second, or third rest periods as required by California law.

25 128. Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay a rest  
26 period premium to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees for each workday in which there  
27 was a missed or otherwise unlawful rest period. Based on further information and belief, when a  
28 rest premium was paid, DEFENDANTS failed to include non-discretionary compensation including

1 but not limited to, bonuses/incentive pay, shift differential pay, multiple base rates of pay and/or  
2 other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of compensation for purposes of  
3 determining the owed rest period premium.

4 129. As such, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198-1199, and  
5 all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties  
6 under Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699, and all applicable Wage Orders, §20.

7 **Minimum and Overtime Wage Violations**

8 130. California law provides that employees in California must be paid for all hours  
9 worked, up to forty (40) hour per week or eight (8) hours per day, at a regular rate that is no less  
10 than the mandated minimum wage. *See* Labor Code section 1197 and the applicable Wage Order.  
11 The minimum wage standard applies to each hour employees worked for which they were not paid.  
12 Therefore, an employer's failure to pay for any particular hour worked by an employee is unlawful  
13 even if averaging an employee's total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average  
14 hourly wage above minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324.

15 131. California law also provides that employees in California must be paid overtime,  
16 equal to 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours per  
17 week or 8 hours per day. *See* Labor Code 510 and the applicable Wage Order section 3. Employers  
18 must pay overtime equal to double the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond  
19 twelve (12) hours per workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh  
20 consecutive day of work in a work week. *Ibid.*

21 132. As explained above, DEFENDANTS violated California's minimum wage and  
22 overtime wage laws by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees for all hours  
23 worked by virtue of, among other things, DEFENDANTS' time rounding, automatic deduction for  
24 meal periods, off-the-clock/unpaid work completed during meal periods, other pre-shift, post-shift  
25 and/or otherwise off-the-clock work, and/or payment according to scheduled hours worked rather  
26 than actual hours worked (described above), which resulted in the failure to account for all hours  
27 worked and thus the denial of minimum and overtime wages.

28 133. DEFENDANTS had and continue to have a policy of failing to pay PLAINTIFF and

1 Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked.

2 134. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual or constructive  
3 knowledge that its time-rounding policies and practices, auto-deduction policies and practices for  
4 meal periods, failure to relieve employees of all duties and employer control during unpaid meal  
5 periods, policy and practice of payment according to scheduled work time rather than actual work  
6 time, and/or other mandated off-the-clock work resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages  
7 owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees.

8 135. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay twice Aggrieved  
9 Employees' regular rate(s) of pay for time worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for  
10 time worked beyond eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week, in  
11 violation of California's overtime laws.

12 136. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further violated California's  
13 overtime wage laws by failing to incorporate all non-discretionary compensation, including but not  
14 limited to, non-discretionary bonus compensation, shift differentials, and/or other non-discretionary  
15 compensation into the regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate of pay. Failing to  
16 include non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of pay resulted in a miscalculation of  
17 the overtime wage rate, resulting in the underpayment of overtime wages owed to Aggrieved  
18 Employees.

19 137.

20 138. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved  
21 Employees to work more than eight (8) hours on days that were not scheduled workdays without  
22 compensating Aggrieved Employees at twice their regular rate(s) of pay for the time worked beyond  
23 eight (8) hours on those days, in violation of California overtime laws, including but not limited to,  
24 California Labor Code sections 510 and 511, the applicable Wage Order, and Labor Code section  
25 1198.

26 **Statutory Wage Violations**

27 139. California Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for an employer to secretly pay  
28 wages lower than required by statute while purporting to pay legal wages. As described above,

1 DEFENDANTS willfully and systematically denied PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees of all  
2 earned minimum and overtime compensation for all hours worked which resulted in the payment of  
3 less than statutorily required wages. DEFENDANTS acted with the intent to deprive them of  
4 statutory wages, including, but not limited to, minimum and overtime wages, to which they were  
5 entitled to under California law. Thus, DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved  
6 Employees lower wages than those they were entitled to while purporting that PLAINTIFF and  
7 other Aggrieved Employees were properly paid. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved  
8 Employees are entitled to recover penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to  
9 Labor Code § 2699(f)-(g).

10  
11 **Refusal to Make Payment**

12 140. Labor Code section 216 declares unlawful an employer's refusal to pay wages due  
13 and payable and/or the denial of the validity of any claim to wages due. DEFENDANTS violated  
14 and continue to violate this section by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees for all  
15 hours worked at the proper wage rate and by failing to pay an additional hour of pay for each  
16 meal/rest period not provided or that was otherwise unlawful. *Gould v. Maryland Sound Industries,*  
17 *Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1154-1155. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil  
18 penalties under Labor Code section 225.5. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for  
19 each Aggrieved Employee, for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.<sup>3</sup>

20 **Business Expense Violations**

21 141. California law requires employers to indemnify their employees for all necessary  
22 expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of  
23 their obedience to the directions of the employer. *See* Cal. Lab. Code s. 2802 and all applicable  
24 Wage Orders section 9(b). Furthermore, "for purposes of [section 2802], the term 'necessary  
25 expenditure or losses' shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees  
26

27 <sup>3</sup> Labor Code § 225.5 (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty  
28 provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in violation of sections 212,  
216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty...for each failure to pay each employee") (emphasis added).

1 incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section.”

2 142. Among other things, under California law, when employees must use their personal  
3 cellphones for work-related purposes, the employer must reimburse them for a reasonable  
4 percentage of their cell phone bills. *See Cochran v. Schwan’s Home Services, Inc.* (2014) 228  
5 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140. To show liability, an employee will only need to show that he or she was  
6 required to use their personal cellphone for work-related purposes and not reimbursed for the use.  
7 *Id.* 1144-1145.

8 143. Further, “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to  
9 waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive  
10 any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled to under  
11 the laws of this State.” *See* Cal. Lab. Code section 2804.

12 144. As described above, PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees were improperly  
13 required to pay for business expenses that are legally the responsibility of the employer.

14 145. DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees with  
15 full reimbursement for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required  
16 that PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees subsidize and/or carry the burden of business  
17 expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

18 146. As a result of DEFENDANTS’ unlawful conduct, PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved  
19 Employees have suffered injury in that they were not completely reimbursed as mandated by  
20 California law.

21 147. Despite being aware of these business expenses, DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse  
22 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees for such expenses in violation of California Labor  
23 Code § 2802. In turn, there constitutes a PAGA violation based on violations of California Labor  
24 Code § 2802 and the applicable Wage Order.

25 **Wage Statement Violations**

26 148. California law requires every employer semi-monthly or at the time of each payment  
27 of wages to furnish its employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing that contains  
28 the following: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of

1 piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;  
2 (4) all deductions; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee  
3 is paid; (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number  
4 or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address  
5 of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay  
6 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Lab. Code § 226.

7 149. Moreover, due to violations detailed above, including but not limited to,  
8 DEFENDANTS' failure to pay regular and overtime wages for all hours worked, failure to provide  
9 meal and rest break premiums, and failure to pay all sick leave wages at the proper rates,  
10 DEFENDANTS have violated California Labor Code § 226 by willfully failing to furnish  
11 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements that listed  
12 the gross and net wages earned and the correct applicable rates of pay for all hours worked. Based  
13 on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all forms of non-discretionary  
14 compensation earned during the pay period into the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating  
15 the owed overtime rate, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour of  
16 overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees.

17 150. As explained above, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list the  
18 "total hours worked" by PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees (by virtue of rounded time entries,  
19 automatic deduction for meal periods/failure to relieve Aggrieved Employees of all duties and  
20 employer control during unpaid meal periods, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather  
21 than actual hours worked, and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices all described in  
22 greater detail *supra*), which results in a violation of Labor Code section 226(a). Failure to list all  
23 hours worked on a wage statement, gives rise to an inference of injury under Labor Code Section  
24 226 (*Maldonado v. Epsilon Plastics, Inc.*, (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 1308, 1337).

25 151. Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed  
26 to list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of  
27 hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9). For  
28 example, as described herein, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed to

1 incorporate all forms of non-discretionary compensation earned during the pay period into the  
2 overtime pay rate calculation, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour  
3 of overtime worked by Aggrieved Employees.

4 152. Separately, and independent from the above allegations, DEFENDANTS issued  
5 wage statements to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees that violate Labor Code section  
6 226(a)(8), by failing to list the correct name and/or address of the legal entity that is the employer.

7 153. DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately list all hours worked on all wage statements  
8 caused confusion to PLAINTIFF and caused and continues to cause confusion to other Aggrieved  
9 Employees over whether they received all wages owed to them.

10 154. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury as  
11 they could not easily determine whether they received all wages owed to them and whether they  
12 were paid for all hours worked.

13 155. Moreover, as a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to list the correct name and/or  
14 address of the legal entity that is the employer, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees have suffered  
15 injury as they could not contact their employer regarding any question(s) they had about wages paid.

16 156. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to provide PLAINTIFF and  
17 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements.

18 157. As a result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful conduct, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved  
19 Employees have suffered injury. The absence of accurate information on their wage statements has  
20 prevented earlier challenges to DEFENDANTS' unlawful pay practices, will require discovery and  
21 mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed, and will cause difficulty and  
22 expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records. DEFENDANTS' conduct led to the  
23 submission of inaccurate information about wages and amounts deducted from wages to state and  
24 federal government agencies. As a result, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees are required to  
25 participate in this lawsuit and create more difficulty and expense from having to reconstruct time  
26 and pay records than if DEFENDANT had complied with its legal obligations.

27 158. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.  
28 Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each Aggrieved Employee, for each pay period

1 during which the statute provisions were violated.<sup>4</sup>

2 **Failure to Produce Records in Violation of Labor Code §§ 226(b)-(c), 1198.5, and 432**

3 159. Time and Pay Records: Labor Code section 226 and all applicable IWC Wage  
4 Orders, section 7 require that employers keep the following information on file for each employee  
5 for a minimum of three years: The employee's dates of employment; the employee's hourly rates  
6 and the corresponding number of hours worked by the employee at each hourly rate, when the  
7 employee begins and ends each work period (including meal periods) and split intervals; total hours  
8 worked by the employee; all deductions; gross wages earned; and net wages earned.

9 160. Section (b) of Labor Code section 226 further requires employers to "afford current  
10 and former employees the right to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their  
11 employment upon reasonable request to the employer." Section (c) of Labor Code section 226  
12 provides that, "an employer who receives a written or oral request to inspect or receive a copy of  
13 records pursuant to subdivision (b) pertaining to a current or former employee shall comply with  
14 the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request. A  
15 violation of this subdivision is an infraction." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe  
16 entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar (\$750) penalty from  
17 the employer. Lab. Code section 226(f).

18 161. Personnel Records. In addition to their right to time and pay records, employees, and  
19 their representatives, have the right to inspect and receive a copy of their personnel files pursuant to  
20 Labor Code section 1198.5. This statute applies to both former and current employees. Labor Code  
21 section 432 further specifies that employers must furnish copies of all employment records bearing  
22 the employee's signature. Labor Code section 1198.5 also requires that the file be made available  
23 for inspection or receipt within a "reasonable" amount of time, but "not later than 30 calendar days  
24 from the date the employer receives a written request." An employer's failure to comply within this  
25 timeframe likewise entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar  
26 (\$750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 1198.5(k).

27 162. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS fail to timely produce or make

28 <sup>4</sup> Labor Code § 226.3 (establishing that the civil penalty is "per employee per violation").

1 available Aggrieved Employees' personnel records and/or payroll records when requested pursuant  
2 to Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, 432, and/or the applicable Wage Order. These violations subject  
3 DEFENDANTS to penalties under Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, and 2699.

4 **Failure to Provide Suitable Resting Facilities**

5 163. Per section 13 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with  
6 suitable resting facilities. Section 13(B) of the Wage Orders provides: "Suitable resting facilities  
7 shall be provided in an area separate from the toilet rooms and shall be available to employees during  
8 work hours."

9 164. DEFENDANTS' restaurants/locations are generally similar in layout and design, and  
10 there was, and continues to be, space that allows for a resting facility that employees may use to  
11 cease work and recover during meal or rest periods. DEFENDANTS could have provided  
12 PLAINTIFF Aggrieved Employees with a resting facility within the restaurant with reasonable or  
13 no modification. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS denied and continues to deny,  
14 employees with suitable areas to rest (e.g. a breakroom). As a result, PLAINTIFF and other  
15 Aggrieved Employees were forced to adjust to areas not conducive to resting, or search for facilities  
16 outside of the restaurant.

17 165. DEFENDANTS did not provide PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees with  
18 suitable resting facilities during their hours of work, particularly during meal and/or rest periods.  
19 Moreover, DEFENDANTS did not inform PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees of their  
20 rights to suitable resting facilities under California law.

21 166. DEFENDANTS' failure to provide suitable resting facilities to PLAINTIFF and  
22 other Aggrieved Employees violated and continue to violate the applicable Wage Order, section  
23 13(B) and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

24 **Seating Violations**

25 167. Per section 14(A-B) of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be  
26 provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats and  
27 when they are not actively engaged in the work duties that would not permit them to be seated.?

28 168. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, Section 14(A-B) provides:

1           169. (A) All working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of  
2 the work reasonably permits the use of seats.

3           170. (B) When employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and  
4 the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in  
5 reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it  
6 does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

7           171. Suitable seating is one of the worker protections covered by California's Wage  
8 Orders, which have the same dignity as statutes, are remedial in nature and are to be broadly  
9 construed to effectuate the goal of protecting the comfort and welfare of employees. Brinker  
10 Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1027 (2012).

11           172. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Aggrieved  
12 Employees with suitable seating, and when such employees were not engaged in duties which  
13 required them to stand, no seating was placed in reasonable proximity to their workstations.

14           173. Moreover, based on information and belief, the nature of the work reasonably  
15 permitted the use of seats for at least part of the time that PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved  
16 Employees were working. Lastly, there were periods of time when PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved  
17 Employees were not engaged in active duties of their employment, yet there were no suitable seats  
18 in reasonable proximity to the work area and use of seats would not interfere with the performance  
19 of their duties.

20           174. The Aggrieved Employees worked in various positions. The nature of PLAINTIFF's  
21 and other Aggrieved Employees' work reasonably permitted the use of seats. However,  
22 DEFENDANTS failed to provide suitable seating in reasonable proximity to Aggrieved Employees'  
23 work areas in violation of section 14(A-B) of all applicable Wage Orders, and Labor Code sections  
24 1198 and 1199, subjecting DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1199 and  
25 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and IWC Wage Order provision, for each  
26 Aggrieved Employee, results in a separate civil penalty.

27           **Standard Conditions of Labor Violations**

28           175. Together, Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199 make unlawful any employment of

1 any employee under conditions of labor prohibited by the Wage Orders, and any violation, refusal,  
2 or neglect to comply with any provision within Part 4, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code, including  
3 sections 1174, 1197, and 1198, or order or ruling of the commission. Therefore, DEFENDANTS'  
4 violations with respect to meal periods, rest periods, record keeping provisions, business expenses,  
5 seating, suitable resting facilities and minimum/overtime wages result in separate violations of  
6 sections 1198 and 1199, which subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections  
7 1197.1 and 2699.

8 **Sick Leave Violations**

9 176. DEFENDANTS violated California's paid sick leave laws including, Labor Code  
10 section 245-248.5 and 233-234. DEFENDANTS either failed to provide sick leave pay to  
11 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees or failed to properly accrue paid sick leave due to  
12 DEFENDANTS' failure to account for actual hours worked (as explained above), and/or failure to  
13 incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all forms of non-discretionary remuneration including but  
14 not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses/incentive pay, shift differential pay, multiple base rates of  
15 pay and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the sick leave pay rate calculation.

16 177. DEFENDANTS further failed to give PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees  
17 notice of their paid sick leave rights – or thereby putting their entitlement to sick leave in a Labor  
18 Code section 2810.5 notice. In addition, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain accurate records of used  
19 sick leave and the balance of paid sick leave left to the employees, which affected PLAINTIFF and  
20 Aggrieved Employees' intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave.

21 178. But for this failure, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees would have used  
22 their paid sick leave at least prior to their respective separations, for as on several occasions  
23 thereafter, he or she would have been entitled to use the banked sick leave and earn appropriate  
24 compensation.

25 179. In violation of Labor Code section 247.5, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain records  
26 documenting the hours worked and paid sick days accrued and used by PLAINTIFF and all  
27 Aggrieved Employees, permitting the presumption that PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved Employees  
28 were entitled to the maximum number of hours accruable.

1           180. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to comply  
2 with Labor Code section 246, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved Employees with  
3 a Labor Code section 226 wage statement, or separate writing containing the amount of paid sick  
4 leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays  
5 wages.

6           181. These practices violated California's sick leave laws, Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*

7           182. On information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges that all of these practices were  
8 experienced and continue to be experienced by other Aggrieved Employees.

9           183. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks all appropriate relief under the PAGA, the  
10 aforementioned code provisions including but not limited to Labor Code section 233 and 234, and  
11 seeks injunctive relief, attorney's fees, declaratory relief, and penalties as permitted by law.

12           **Failure To Provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave.**

13           184. Labor Code § 248.2 provides that all employers with 26 or more employees are  
14 required to provide up to 80 hours for covered employees to take 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental  
15 Paid Sick Leave to care for themselves, to care for a family member or if it is vaccine-related. Based  
16 on information and belief, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 248.2 by not providing Aggrieved  
17 Employees with required 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave. Based on information  
18 and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave in 2022 in violation of  
19 Labor Code section 248.6.

20           **Failure to Pay Vested Vacation/Paid Time Off**

21           185. California Labor Code section 227.3 provides that when an employer policy provides  
22 for paid vacations and/or paid time off, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his,  
23 her, or their vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to the employee as wages at the  
24 employee's final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting  
25 eligibility or time served and that there shall be no forfeiture of vested vacation time or paid time  
26 off upon termination.

27           186. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had and continue to have a  
28 uniform policy and practice of failing to allow Aggrieved Employees to use their earned

1 vacation/paid time off during their employment and failing to pay all vested, accrued paid time off  
2 to Aggrieved Employees upon separation of employment, in violation of California law, including  
3 but not limited to, Labor Code section 227.3.

4 **Violation of Labor Code section 351 and 353**

5 187. Labor Code Section 351 prohibits employers and their agents from sharing in or  
6 keeping any portion of a gratuity left for or given to one or more employees by a patron.  
7 Furthermore, it is illegal for employers to make wage deductions from gratuities, or from using  
8 gratuities as direct or indirect credits against an employee's wages. Labor Code Section 353  
9 mandates employers to keep accurate records of all gratuities received.

10 188. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to ensure that PLAINTIFF  
11 and other Aggrieved Employees fully received the gratuities left for them by patrons, in that  
12 DEFENDANTS and its agents would collect and/or take a portion of the gratuities for themselves,  
13 in violation of Labor Code Section 351. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS  
14 also failed/fails to keep accurate records of all tips received, in violation of Labor Code Section 353.  
15 Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay gratuities paid by customers using  
16 credit cards to Aggrieved Employees by the next regular payday following the credit card payment,  
17 in violation of Labor Code section 351.

18 189. Pursuant to PAGA, DEFENDANTS are liable for penalties of \$100 per pay period  
19 payable to each Aggrieved Employee for the first violation of Labor Code Sections 351 and 353  
20 they experienced within the statutory period, and \$200 per pay period for each additional violation.

21 **Untimely Payment of Final Wages**

22 190. California Labor Code section 201(a) provides, in relevant part, that “[i]f an  
23 employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and  
24 payable immediately.” California Labor Code section 202(a) provides, in relevant part, that “[i]f an  
25 employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her  
26 wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has  
27 given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled  
28 to his or her wages at the time of quitting.”

1           191. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, an employer that willfully fails to pay wages  
2 due an employee who is terminated or resigns must pay (in addition to the unpaid wages) a penalty  
3 equal to the employee's daily wages for each day, not exceeding 30 days, that the wages are unpaid.  
4 Case law clarifies this 30-day waiting time penalty is recoverable under the PAGA via Labor Code  
5 section 256. See, *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014); see also,  
6 *Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 134 Cal. App. 4th 365 (2005).

7           192. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS fail to timely pay final wages to  
8 Aggrieved Employees upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code sections 201-202  
9 and/or did not include all owed vacation pay and/or fail to timely provide final wages with all owed  
10 vacation and/or paid time off. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS untimely provide  
11 final wages to Aggrieved Employees without regard to the timing requirements of Labor Code  
12 sections 201-202.

13           193. Moreover, final paychecks, once provided to Aggrieved Employees did not include  
14 all wages owed as they are devoid of, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages,  
15 overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, and all owed sick leave and/or paid time off wages  
16 at the properly accrued rates.

17           194. As a result, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. These  
18 violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 203, 210, and/or  
19 256.

20                           **Unlawful Agreements/ Unlawful Criminal History Inquiries**

21                           Unlawful Agreements.

22           195. Labor Code section 432.5 provides that “no employer...shall require any employee  
23 or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such  
24 employer...to be prohibited by law.” DEFENDANTS required and continue to require PLAINTIFF  
25 and Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to submit to unlawful criminal and/or financial checks  
26 as a condition of obtaining and/or continuing employment.

27           196. The California Labor Code places certain procedural and substantive limits on an  
28 employers’ ability to conduct employee background checks and on how employers can use the

1 information they obtain through those background checks. Labor Code section 1024.5 states that  
2 employers, except for financial institutions, may order a credit check only if the individual works  
3 (or is applying to work) in certain positions (e.g., managerial positions, financially-related positions,  
4 and certain government positions). Additionally, the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies  
5 Act (ICRAA- CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq.*) and the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA - 15  
6 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.*) mandate several requirements prior to and following an employee  
7 background check, including but not limited to identifying an appropriate reason for the background  
8 check, a separate consent form with required disclosures and certain formatting requirements,  
9 additional forms such as a summary of rights, a way by which to request a copy of the report, as  
10 well as proper notice of adverse actions taken, among other statutory requirements.

11         197. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS ordered unlawful financial credit  
12 checks on Aggrieved Employees, in violation of Labor Code section 1024.5, and required them to  
13 provide ongoing written consent to the unlawful credit checks as a condition of employment, in  
14 violation of California and Federal law, which results in a violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

15         198. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to  
16 submit and/or agree to submit in writing to unlawful criminal background checks and/or unlawful  
17 non-compete and/or unlawful non-solicitation agreements as a condition of obtaining and/or holding  
18 employment in violation of the ICRAA and the FCRA as alleged above and/or the California  
19 Business and Professions Code and/or the California Labor Code.

20         199. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved  
21 Employees to agree in writing to provide DEFENDANTS with ongoing consent to conduct  
22 background checks throughout the duration of employment, in violation of the ICRAA and/or FCRA  
23 and/or other applicable laws, resulting in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5, by  
24 requiring applicants and employees to agree to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment.

25         200. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS knew that requiring  
26 Aggrieved Employees to agree to unlawful criminal and/or financial background checks as a  
27 condition of obtaining and/or holding employment was unlawful.

28         201. By requiring that Aggrieved Employees sign off on the illegal background and/or

1 financial checks, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5.

2 Unlawful Inquires into Criminal History

3 202. Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits an employer from asking applicants about past  
4 arrest(s) unless they resulted in conviction(s) and even then, certain limitations apply. Based on  
5 information and belief, DEFENDANTS asked Aggrieved Employees about arrests not resulting in  
6 convictions on its employment application, in violation of California law.

7 203. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in violation of California law,  
8 including but not limited to the Fair Chance Act/the California Fair Employment and Housing Act  
9 (“FEHA”), asked Aggrieved Employees about convictions prior to extending an offer of  
10 employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired into criminal history on its employment  
11 application in violation of California law.

12 204. By asking about arrests not resulting in convictions, DEFENDANTS violated Labor  
13 Code section 432.7. By asking about convictions at the application phase or prior to extending an  
14 employment offer, DEFENDANTS violated California’s Fair Chance Act, and thereby violated  
15 Labor Code section 432.5 by unlawfully requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to  
16 disclose arrests and/or convictions as a condition of employment.

17 205. Under the provisions of PAGA and the above mentioned Labor Code sections,  
18 including but not limited to Labor Code sections 201-203, 204, 216, 221-223, 226, 226.7, 245-248.5,  
19 351-353, 432, 432.5, 432.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1024.5, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5,  
20 1199, 2802, 2810.5 and all applicable Wage Orders as well as all interpretations of these laws by  
21 California Courts and administrative bodies, as well as any other law that is enforceable through  
22 PAGA, DEFENDANTS are liable for the following penalties:

23 a. All statutorily-specified penalties recoverable under PAGA as enumerated in the  
24 relevant California Labor Code provisions listed herein only if permitted by the PAGA statute,  
25 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a); and

26 b. Default PAGA penalties for any violation of the enumerated list of Labor Code  
27 violations without a civil penalty recoverable under the PAGA, all in the default amounts provided  
28 by Labor Code section 2699(f).

1 c. The proper measure of penalties under PAGA is the number of violations, whether  
2 those violations were committed as against PLAINTIFF or any Aggrieved Employee, whether a  
3 party to this action or not.

4 206. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), and/or any and all other applicable laws,  
5 PLAINTIFF is entitled to recover civil penalties, costs, and attorney's fees.

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for relief and judgment as follows on behalf of the State  
8 of California and all Aggrieved Employees:

- 9 1. For civil penalties under Labor Code Section 2699 (75% payable to the  
10 LWDA and 25% payable to Aggrieved Employees);
- 11 2. For an order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and  
12 restraining DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set  
13 forth herein;
- 14 3. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and
- 15 4. For such other and further relief that the Court deems just and proper.

16 Dated: January 10, 2023

**CROSNER LEGAL, PC**

17  
18 By:   
19 Michael R. Crosner, Esq.  
20 Zachary M. Crosner, Esq.  
21 Jamie Serb, Esq.  
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# **EXHIBIT**

**1**



Los Angeles Office  
9440 Santa Monica Blvd.  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.  
[kiara@crosnerlegal.com](mailto:kiara@crosnerlegal.com)  
direct: (424) 335-5236  
office: (310) 496-5818  
fax: (310) 510-6429

---

November 4, 2022

**VIA PAGA ONLINE FILING ONLY:**

California Labor & Workforce  
Development Agency  
ATTN: PAGA Administrator  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
[PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov](mailto:PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov)

**VIA U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL:**

Charles Lew  
Agent for Service of Process for:  
**Greco Entertainment Group, Inc.**  
9440 Santa Monica Blvd. Ste. 301  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

**Greco Entertainment Group, Inc.**  
Attn: Human Resources/ Legal Department  
9440 Santa Monica Blvd. Ste. 301  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Charles Lew,  
Agent for Service of Process for:  
**2460 Wilshire Restaurant LLC**  
9440 Santa Monica Blvd. Ste. 301  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

**2460 Wilshire Restaurant LLC**  
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department  
2460 Wilshire Blvd.  
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Charles Lew,  
Agent for Service of Process for:  
**2454 Wilshire Restaurant, LLC**  
9440 Santa Monica Blvd. Ste.  
301  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

**2454 Wilshire Restaurant, LLC**  
Attn: Human Resources / Legal  
Department  
2454 Wilshire Blvd.  
Santa Monica, CA 90403

## **NOTICE OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM**

---

To: California Labor and Workforce Development Agency; Greco Entertainment Group, Inc.; 2454 Wilshire Restaurant, LLC; and 2460 Wilshire Restaurant LLC;  
Date: November 4, 2022  
Subject: *Christian Montoya v. Greco Entertainment Group, Inc. et. al.*

---

### **Introduction**

This office represents COMPLAINANT, Christian Montoya (hereinafter “COMPLAINANT”) in connection with COMPLAINANT’s claims under the California Labor Code. COMPLAINANT was, at all relevant times herein mentioned, an employee of the following entities and individual managing agents of said entities: Greco Entertainment Group, Inc.; 2454 Wilshire Restaurant, LLC; and 2460 Wilshire Restaurant LLC (hereinafter, these entities and their managing agents are collectively referred to as “EMPLOYER”). EMPLOYER may be contacted directly at the addresses listed above.

Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, COMPLAINANT, on behalf of COMPLAINANT, and on behalf of all current and former non-exempt employees employed by EMPLOYER in California within one year of the date of this notice (“NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) and on behalf of all current and former exempt employees employed by EMPLOYER in California within one year of the date of this notice (“EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”), hereby gives written notice (“NOTICE”) of COMPLAINANT’s claims against EMPLOYER. This NOTICE is being provided via online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and EMPLOYER via certified mail to its Agent(s) for Service of Process and/or entity mailing address as provided to the California Secretary of State.

This NOTICE also serves to demonstrate COMPLAINANT’s reasonable attempt at settlement with EMPLOYER. If EMPLOYER is interested in settling this matter before a lawsuit is filed, EMPLOYER may contact Crosner Legal, P.C., at the address listed at the close of this NOTICE. This settlement attempt is in compliance with relevant California law. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal.4th 553, 561.

This NOTICE is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5. This NOTICE further reserves any and all rights by COMPLAINANT to amend this notice to include, amend, or add further charges upon discovery of new violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code. In addition, to the extent that entities and/or other individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code sections including, but not limited to sections 558.1 and 1197.1—COMPLAINANT reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue. Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this NOTICE.

Consequently, EMPLOYER is on notice that COMPLAINANT continues its investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of *any* of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein. For violations that are curable under § 2699.3(c) and that EMPLOYER intends to cure within the statutory time period set forth in §§ 2699 and 2699.3(c), the EMPLOYER shall provide notice including a description of the actions taken to cure. If the alleged violation is not cured within the statutory time period, COMPLAINANT will commence a civil action pursuant to section 2699. For all other violations that are not curable, an action pursuant to section 2699(a) and 2699(f) will commence after the requirements under 2699.3 are fulfilled.

Based on the following summary of facts and theories upon which COMPLAINANT will base COMPLAINANT's claims, COMPLAINANT requests that the LWDA regard this NOTICE as written notice of COMPLAINANT's intent to seek civil penalties against EMPLOYER.

COMPLAINANT, on behalf of COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, alleges that the specific provisions of California law that EMPLOYER has violated, requiring this NOTICE, include but are not limited to: California Labor Code sections 201-203, 204, 216, 221-223, 226, 226.7, 245-248.5, 351-353, 432, 432.5, 432.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1024.5, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2810.5, and all applicable Wage Orders.

**The Named Entities Are Joint Employers of COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES**

California courts have recognized that the definition of “employer” for purposes of enforcement of the California Labor Code goes beyond the concept of traditional employment to reach irregular working arrangements for the purpose of preventing evasion and subterfuge of California's labor laws. *Martinez v. Combs* (2010) 49 Cal.4th 35, 65. As such, anyone who directly or indirectly, or through an agent or any other person, engages, suffers, or permits any person to work or exercises control over the wages, hours, or working conditions of any person, may be liable for violations of the California Labor Code as to that person.

COMPLAINANT is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times EMPLOYER and unknown entities operated as a single integrated enterprise with common ownership and centralized human resources as set forth herein. Under California law, in determining whether two defendant entities are liable as an integrated enterprise, courts consider four factors: (1) centralized control of labor relations; (2) interrelation of operations; (3) common management; and (4) common ownership or financial control. *Laird v. Capital Cities/Abc, Inc.* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 727, 737 (overruled on other grounds, *Reid v. Google, Inc.* (2010) 50 Cal. 4th 512 (2010).)

COMPLAINANT believes and hereon asserts that EMPLOYER and unknown entities must be classified as joint employers of COMPLAINANT for purposes of liability for civil penalties under PAGA, as the aforementioned entities engaged, suffered and permitted COMPLAINANT to

perform services from which they benefited, and furthermore that the aforementioned entities had the right to exercise control over the wages, hours and/or working conditions of COMPLAINANT at all relevant times herein, so as to be considered the joint employers of COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. By reason of their status as joint employers of COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, they are each liable for civil penalties for violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders as to COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

### **Individual Liability Under Labor Code § 558.1**

Labor Code section 558.1 permits joint and several liability as to both an individual and employer for violations of Labor Code sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1194, and 2802. EMPLOYER, at all relevant times, was an employer or person acting on behalf of employer(s) who violated COMPLAINANT's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code. The California Legislature defines "other person acting on behalf of an employer" as "*a natural person* who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent of the employer." The "managing agent" definition mirrors that found in California's punitive damages statute (subdivision (b) of section 3294 of the Civil Code). Under that statute and supporting case law, "managing agents" are all employees who exercise substantial independent authority and judgment in their corporate decision-making such that their decisions ultimately determine corporate policy. *White v. Ultramar, Inc.* (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 563, 566-67. For the reasons set forth above and others, at all relevant times, any above-listed individuals meet the criteria of managing agents under California law, and therefore, may be held liable under California Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 for violations of Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, and 1194 as further described in detail below.

COMPLAINANT intends to further name any unknown individuals responsible for violations arising under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 after further discovery. COMPLAINANT will ask the Court to relate the amendment of the PAGA charge and the operative complaint to the date of filing of these charges. COMPLAINANT asks and demands that EMPLOYER put these individuals on notice immediately to provide them as much notice possible to mount in defense. In the alternative, COMPLAINANT also offers to EMPLOYER to place those individuals on notice if EMPLOYER voluntarily provides their contact information.

### **General Information**

EMPLOYER owns, operates or otherwise manages several restaurants, venues, facilities, and/or locations in California, including but not limited to at three restaurants in Santa Monica operating under the following names: Fia Restaurant, Fia Steak and Dono.<sup>1</sup> Although EMPLOYER may operate successful companies or have a noble mission, EMPLOYER does not comply with California's labor laws.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://grecoentertainmentgroup.com/about-us>. Last visited on November 4, 2022.

COMPLAINANT is currently employed by EMPLOYER as a non-exempt employee. COMPLAINANT worked for EMPLOYER as a cook and/or similar title from on or around October 15, 2021 through the present. COMPLAINANT worked for EMPLOYER out of one of EMPLOYER's restaurants located in Santa Monica, California, that operated/operates under the name Fia. COMPLAINANT regularly worked at least eight (8)-nine (9) hours per day, at least (5) days per week. EMPLOYER paid COMPLAINANT an hourly rate for time counted by EMPLOYER as hours worked.

Among other things, EMPLOYER (1) failed and continues to fail to keep accurate and complete time records for COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES; (2) failed and continues to fail to pay COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked; (3) failed and continues to fail to pay COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at least minimum wage for all hours worked and overtime/regular rates for corresponding work; (4) failed and continues to fail to pay proper overtime wages for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary compensation into the overtime premium pay calculations; (5) failed and continues to fail to provide COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with proper meal and/or rest breaks, and/or compensate COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of premium pay at the regular rate of compensation for missed/improper meal and/or rest periods; (6) refused and continues to refuse to make and/or falsely denied the amount of payments due to COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, including but not limited to, owed sick pay; (7) failed and continues to fail to place COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on proper notice of their workplace rights, including but not limited to owed sick pay; (8) failed and continues to fail to provide legally compliant wage statements to COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES; (9) made unlawful deductions from COMPLAINANT's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' paychecks; (10) failed and continues to fail to timely pay wages to COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES during employment and/or upon separation of employment; (11) failed and continues to fail to reimburse COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses incurred on behalf of EMPLOYER; (12) conducted and continues to conduct illegal criminal and/or financial background checks as a condition of COMPLAINANT's, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' hire and continued employment; (13) required and continues to require COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to disclose arrests not resulting in convictions and/or to disclose convictions prior to extending an offer of employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired and continues to inquire into COMPLAINANT's, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES', and/or EXPEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' criminal history on their employment applications and sign off on same as a condition of employment; (14) failed and continues to fail to provide suitable seating and suitable resting facilities; and (15) required and continues to require COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED

EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to a term or condition that violates the law as a condition of employment. Further descriptions of the above-mentioned violations and others are explained below.

### **Labor Code Violations**

**Recordkeeping Requirement Violations:** California Labor Code section 1174 requires employers to keep “accurate and complete” payroll records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 similarly requires employers to keep accurate time records reflecting the times during which all owed meal periods were provided each day.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed, and continues to fail, to keep accurate and complete payroll records as required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked, applicable rates of pay, time records showing when COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and accurate itemized wage statements.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed and continues to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by virtue of EMPLOYER’s time rounding and/or auto deduction policies and practices and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices.

EMPLOYER failed and continues to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by virtue of EMPLOYER’s failure to relieve COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and EMPLOYER’s control for unpaid meal periods, resulting in unpaid hours worked.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER further failed, and continues to fail, to record the true start and end times of COMPLAINANT’s and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ meal periods.

Based on further information and belief, EMPLOYER further failed and continues to fail, to record the true start and end times of COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ work shifts.

Additionally, EMPLOYER failed, and continues to fail to keep accurate records and issue accurate wage statements by not documenting accrued sick time for COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

EMPLOYER’s failure to keep “accurate and complete” payroll records for COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES violates Labor Code sections 1174, 1198, 1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7. These violations subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 226.6, 1174.5 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor

Code section and Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.<sup>2</sup>

**Violations of Labor Code Sections 226(b)-(c), 1198.5, and 432:**

**Time and Pay Records**

Labor Code section 226 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 require that employers keep the following information on file for each employee for a minimum of three years: The employee's dates of employment; the employee's hourly rates and the corresponding number of hours worked by the employee at each hourly rate, when the employee begins and ends each work period (including meal periods) and split intervals; total hours worked by the employee; all deductions; gross wages earned; and net wages earned.

Section (b) of Labor Code section 226 further requires employers to "afford current and former employees the right to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their employment upon reasonable request to the employer." Section (c) of Labor Code section 226 provides that, "an employer who receives a written or oral request to inspect or receive a copy of records pursuant to subdivision (b) pertaining to a current or former employee shall comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request. A violation of this subdivision is an infraction." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar (\$750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 226(f).

**Personnel Records**

In addition to their right to time and pay records, employees, and their representatives, have the right to inspect and receive a copy of their personnel files pursuant to Labor Code section 1198.5. This statute applies to both former and current employees. Labor Code section 432 further specifies that employers must furnish copies of all employment records bearing the employee's signature.

Labor Code section 1198.5 also requires that the file be made available for inspection or receipt within a "reasonable" amount of time, but "not later than 30 calendar days from the date the employer receives a written request." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe likewise entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar (\$750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 1198.5(k).

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER fails to timely produce or make available a current or former employee's personnel records and/or payroll records when requested pursuant to Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, 432, and/or the applicable Wage Order. For example, on December 29, 2021, COMPLAINANT, through counsel, sent a written request for time, payroll and personnel records to EMPLOYER. On February 16, 2022, COMPLAINANT, through counsel, sent a second written request for time, pay and personnel records. Yet, EMPLOYER failed to timely produce any records at all within the time periods delineated by California labor law. To this day, EMPLOYER has not produced COMPLAINANT's requested records. Based on information and

---

<sup>2</sup> See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period").

belief, EMPLOYER failed and continues to fail to timely produce complete time, payroll and personnel records when requested by other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

These violations subject EMPLOYER to penalties under Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.

**Meal Period Violations:** California law requires employers to provide employees a duty-free, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a workday, and it must be provided within the first five (5) hours the employee works. Lab. Code section 512 (and all applicable IWC Wage Orders), section 11(A) and (C); *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1004. Employers must also provide employees with a second duty-free, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than (10) hours in a workday, and it must be provided before the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> hour of work. *Ibid.* Meal periods can be waived, but only under the following circumstances: (1) if an employee's total work period in a day is over five (5) hours but no more than six (6) hours, the required meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, and (2) if an employee's total work period in a day is over ten (10) hours but no more than twelve (12) hours, the required second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, but only if the first meal period was not waived. *Ibid.* Upon information and belief, COMPLAINANT did not sign a valid meal period waiver throughout COMPLAINANT's employment by EMPLOYER.

Employers covered by any and all applicable IWC Wage Orders have an obligation to both (1) relieve their employees for at least one meal period for shifts over five hours (see above), and (2) to record having done so. If the employer fails to properly record a valid meal period, it is presumed that no meal period was provided. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7(A)(3) ("Meal periods . . . shall also be recorded"); *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1004, 1052-1053, citing section 7(A)(3) ("If an employer's records show no meal period for a given shift over five hours, a rebuttable presumption arises that the employee was not relieved of duty and no meal period was provided").

Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employees' regular rate of pay for each missed or unlawful meal period (e.g., less than 30 minutes, interrupted meal period, first meal period provided after five (5) hours, second meal period provided after 10 hours). Lab. Code § 226.7; all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §11(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provision of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided"); *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1004.

COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES consistently worked shifts of five and a one-half (5 ½) hours or more, entitling to at least one meal period.

COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would not receive legally compliant thirty (30) minute first meal breaks. Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were consistently unable to take timely, off duty, thirty-minute, uninterrupted meal periods, often being forced to take late meal periods, interrupted meal periods, and/or work through part or all their meal periods due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties and/or commentary from supervisors pressuring them to take non-compliant meal breaks or skip meal breaks completely. For example, COMPLAINANT was consistently required to work through his owed meal periods completely due to the need to assist customers, complete orders, cook/prep food and/or complete other work tasks, yet EMPLOYER would deduct at least thirty minutes per shift as though a thirty-minute off-duty meal period had been taken when it had not. Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER had and continues to have a uniform policy and practice of clocking out other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or requiring other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to clock out for meal periods that were not taken, worked through and/or on duty, resulting in violations of California's meal periods laws as well as consistent off-the-clock work and the underpayment of minimum and overtime wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, among other violations of the labor code described herein.

Based on information and belief, other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were consistently suffered and permitted to take meal periods past the fifth hour of work and/or had their meal periods interrupted, cut short, restricted to EMPLOYER's premises and/or otherwise on duty due to commentary from supervisors, understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or the need to meet EMPLOYER's goals and expectations.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER implemented policies and/or practices that failed to relieve NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and EMPLOYER's control during unpaid meal periods.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to complete off-the-clock work prior to their scheduled shift time which EMPLOYER failed to take into account when scheduling meal periods for NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on information and belief, meal periods were late, in part due to unaccounted pre-shift off-the-clock work.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER had actual and/or constructive knowledge that its policies and practices resulted in the denial of uninterrupted meal periods which were free of EMPLOYER's control owed to COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's meal period laws.

Based on information and belief, per EMPLOYER's uniform policy and practice, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked shifts of more than ten hours did not receive a second legally compliant thirty (30) minute second meal break.

Based on information and belief, despite EMPLOYER's failure to provide lawful meal periods, EMPLOYER implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding the start and end times of COMPLAINANT's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods and/or automatically deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for missed and/or otherwise unlawful meal periods (including meal periods restricted to EMPLOYER's premises), despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES did not receive lawful meal periods.

Moreover, based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to keep accurate records of the true start and end times of COMPLAINANT's and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods. Based on information and belief, to the extent meal period were recorded, EMPLOYER illegally rounded the start and end times of purported meal periods resulting in COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES not being paid for all time worked as well as late and/or shortened meal periods. *See Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to instruct COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as to the timing and duty-free nature of meal periods. Based on further information and belief, EMPLOYER did not have a compliant written meal break policy, nor did EMPLOYER have any sort of compliant policy in practice. Liability for the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES can be established by evidence that an employer adopted a uniform corporate break policy that failed to give full effect to California law and the applicable Wage Order requirements. The fact that employees may legally waive meal breaks does not affect this result. *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4th 1004.

COMPLAINANT is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that EMPLOYER had actual and/or constructive knowledge that its time-rounding and/or auto-deduction policies and practices resulted in the denial of lawful meal periods owed to COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's meal period laws.

EMPLOYER failed to pay COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, an additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of compensation for each workday a lawful meal period was not provided. EMPLOYER either failed to pay a meal period premium at all for each workday a lawful meal period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper meal period premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses, shift differential pay and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate or compensation for purposes of calculating the owed meal period premium.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 11(A) and (C) along with all applicable IWC Wage Orders. These violations subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 558 and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-

EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.<sup>3</sup> EMPLOYER's failure to provide valid meal periods, and the automatic deduction for meal periods that were not provided/valid, ultimately results in further violations, such as violations of Labor Code sections 1174, 1199, 226.6, discussed above, and other violations discussed below.

**Rest Period Violations:** California law requires employers to provide employees a paid, duty-free ten (10) minute rest period for each four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof. See applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(A). In *Brinker v. Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1004 (2012), the California Supreme Court held that employees are entitled to a 10-minute paid rest period for shifts from 3 ½ to 6 hours in length, two 10-minute rest periods for shifts more than 6 hours up to 10 hours, and three 10-minute rest periods for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours. (*Id.* at 1029). The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employee's regular rate of pay for each missed or improper rest period (e.g., less than 10 minutes, interrupted rest period, rest period(s) at improper time(s) during shift(s). Lab. Code §226.7; applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided").

EMPLOYER did not properly authorize and provide COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with legally compliant rest periods at a rate of every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, that insofar as practicable, are provided in the middle of the work period, as required by law.

COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not adequately informed, authorized, instructed about, nor permitted an opportunity to take proper rest breaks per California law. Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER had no policy in place nor instruction as to the taking of duty-free rest periods. Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER did not have a compliant written rest period policy, nor did EMPLOYER have any sort of compliant rest period policy in practice. For example, COMPLAINANT was consistently required to work through his owed rest periods due to the need to assist customers, complete orders, cook/prep food and/or complete other work tasks. Oftentimes, COMPLAINANT was only able to take a single rest period per shift and that single rest period was usually not a full net ten minutes, was on duty, or otherwise noncompliant with California rest period law.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "i>In addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty...for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' rest periods were interrupted, cut short, on duty, restricted to premises and/or late due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or due to commentary from supervisors/ managers pressuring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to skip rest breaks completely or otherwise take non-compliant rest periods.

Moreover, based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to provide any form of a third rest period on shifts lasting longer than ten hours. For example, based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who work shifts lasting longer than ten (10) hours do not receive any version of a third rest period on those shifts lasting more than ten hours.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER implemented policies and/or practices that failed to relieve COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and EMPLOYER's control during rest periods.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were pressured to complete their work duties according to a designated schedule such that rest breaks were only taken once tasks were completed, and/or as time permitted.

Furthermore, EMPLOYER failed to pay a rest period premium for each day in which NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced a missed or otherwise unlawful rest period in violation of California law. *Bluford v. Safeway Stores, Inc.* (2013) 216 Cal. App. 4th 864, 872. EMPLOYER failed to pay COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, an additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of pay for each workday a proper rest period was not provided. EMPLOYER either failed to pay a rest period premium at all for each workday a lawful rest period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper rest period premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses, shift differential pay, and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of compensation for purposes of calculating the owed rest period premium.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is “for each aggrieved employee per pay period”); and All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that “[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty...for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid”).

**Minimum Wage Violations:** “Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys’ fees, and costs of suit.” Labor Code section 1194.

Labor Code section 1197 states the California requirement that employees must be paid at least the minimum wage fixed by the Commission, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. The minimum wage standard applies to each hour employees worked for which they were not paid. Pursuant to section 4 of the applicable Wage Order, “Every employer shall pay to each employee .... not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period...” The applicable Wage Order defines “hours worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” See §2 of all applicable Wage Orders. Therefore, employers are required to pay employees for all time spent subject to the control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. An employer’s failure to pay for any particular hour worked by an employee is unlawful even if averaging an employee’s total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324. Furthermore, “in any action under Section 98, 1193.6, 1194, or 1197.1 to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage fixed by an order of the commission or by statute, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon...” *Cal. Lab. Code* § 1194.2.

EMPLOYER failed to compensate COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked by virtue of EMPLOYER’s automatic deduction and time rounding policies, and failure to relieve employees of all duties/employer control during unpaid meal periods or otherwise unlawful practices for missed or improper meal periods as explained above.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding meal period start and end times and/or automatically deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for meal periods, despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were subject to EMPLOYER’s control during purported meal periods and/or were otherwise not afforded with lawful meal periods, depriving COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all wages owed.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not paid for all hours worked due to EMPLOYER’s policy and/or practice of paying according to scheduled hours worked instead of actual time worked, and/or mandated off-the clock work policies and/or practices. For example, as explained above, COMPLAINANT was consistently required to work through his purported meal periods completely due to the need to assist customers, complete orders, cook/prep food and/or complete other work tasks, yet EMPLOYER deducted at least thirty

minutes per shift as though a thirty-minute off-duty meal period had been taken when it had not, resulting in at least several hours of off-the-clock work per week and the significant underpayment of wages owed to COMPLAINANT. Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER had and continues to have a uniform policy and practice of clocking out other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or requiring other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to clock out for meal periods that were not taken, worked through and/or on duty, resulting in consistent off-the-clock work and the underpayment of minimum wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, among other violations of the labor code described herein.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER did not compensate NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for time spent donning and doffing personal protective equipment and/or uniforms/work clothing (e.g., gloves, protective eyewear, hairnets, hats, and/or face masks) during meal periods, before the start of a scheduled shift, and/or after completing a scheduled shift, resulting in off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Additionally, COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to perform other off-the-clock work for which they were not compensated. For example, at times, EMPLOYER's electronic/computer employee time-keeping system malfunctioned such that COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to either reinitiate and/or otherwise troubleshoot the system prior to being able to clock in and/or were unable to clock in at all for the start of their shifts and/or clock back in from meal periods, resulting in off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed to COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced the same issues when clocking out for shifts and/or back in for meal periods. This time spent under EMPLOYER's control was not recorded and not compensated and resulted in unpaid minimum wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also pressured to complete at least some of their work tasks off-the-clock in order to meet EMPLOYER's goals and expectations. For example, based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required to complete off-the-clock work outside of scheduled shifts due to work-related phone calls and/or messages they received to their personal phones and were required to respond to, including but not limited to, communications from supervisors regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks, resulting in the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Moreover, based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who opened their work locations were required to first unlock the doors, turn on all the lights in the restaurant/facility and/or deactivate the alarm before clocking in for work, resulting in pre-shift off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on further information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in charge of closing their location(s) were required to first clock out for their shifts before enabling the alarm, turning off all

the lights in the facility and/or locking the doors. This resulted in additional off-the-clock post-shift work that was not compensated and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to pay NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for time they were required to spend completing orientation, policy questionnaires, and/or time spent completing the onboarding process including but not limited to reviewing various documents and policies provided by EMPLOYER. Based on information and belief, this work time was completed off-the-clock and was not compensated.

Based on further information and belief, EMPLOYER implemented a time-rounding system that as applied systematically deprived COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of compensable time because the time-rounding system implemented by EMPLOYER would almost always, if not always, result in understating actual compensable work time. EMPLOYER's failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of its time-rounding practices resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as well as unpaid overtime wages for those NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day and/or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

EMPLOYER's failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of its time rounding, auto-deduction policies and practices for unlawful meal periods, failure to provide lawful meal periods, and/or other off-the-clock work practices and policies, resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as well as unpaid overtime wages for those NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day and/or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER had actual and/or constructive knowledge that its time rounding policies/practices, auto-deduction policies and practices, failure to provide lawful meal periods and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's minimum wage laws.

These violations subject EMPLOYER, to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, 1197.1 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See Lab. Code §1197.1(a) (establishing that the civil penalty is “for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid”); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that “[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty...for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid”).

**Overtime Violations:** California law requires employers to pay overtime equal to one and one-half times the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond eight (8) hours per workday and each hour worked beyond forty (40) hours per work week. Lab. Code §510; IWC Wage Order All applicable IWC Wage Orders §3. Employers must pay overtime equal to double the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week. *Ibid.*

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER violated California's overtime laws by, among other things, failing to correctly calculate, or record, the total number of hours worked by COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and not paying proper overtime rates for overtime worked by virtue of same.

Namely, EMPLOYER's automatic deduction and time rounding policies and practices for meal periods, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather than actual time worked, off-the-clock/unpaid work completed during meal periods and/or time spent restricted to EMPLOYER's premises and/or subject to EMPLOYER's control during off-the-clock meal periods (described above), and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in the failure to account for all hours worked and thus the denial of minimum wages as well as overtime wages owed to COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed and continues to fail to pay premium wage rate for all hours worked beyond eight (8) hours in a day or beyond forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed and continues to fail to pay twice NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' regular rate(s) of pay for time worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for time worked beyond eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week, in violation of California's overtime laws.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, shift differential pay, bonus pay, and/or other non-discretionary pay into the regular rate of pay used to calculate the owed overtime rate(s), resulting in the miscalculation and underpayment of overtime wages owed to COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

This conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 218.5, 510, 558, 558.1, 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, 218.5, and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "in addition to any other civil

**Violation of California Labor Code §§ 245-248.5:** Throughout the relevant time period, EMPLOYER failed to provide proper paid sick leave to COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. EMPLOYER either failed to provide paid sick leave at all or improperly calculated the sick leave accrual and the sick leave rate of pay owed to COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to base the accrued sick leave hours on the correct number of hours worked (as a result of the rounding/automatic deduction policies and practices for meal periods and/or shift start and end times/other required off-the-clock work including but not limited to unpaid meal periods that were restricted to EMPLOYER's premises) and by failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses, shift differential pay, commission and/or piece-rate compensation and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the sick leave pay rate calculation.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER further failed to provide notice of the correct sick leave amount balance available to COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on their wage statements or other written statement.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to put NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED on notice of their paid sick leave rights—or thereby putting their entitlement to sick leave in a Labor Code section 2810.5 notice. In addition, EMPLOYER failed to maintain accurate records of used sick leave and the balance of paid sick leave left to the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE throughout the relevant time period.

Based on information and belief, throughout the relevant period, EMPLOYER failed to provide notice of sick leave amount balance left for COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, thus affecting their intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave. But for this failure, COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would have used their paid sick leave at least prior to their respective separations, for as on several occasions thereafter, he or she would have been entitled to use the banked sick leave and earn appropriate compensation.

This illegal retention of paid sick leave is unlawful, and COMPLAINANT seeks all forms of injunctive relief, restitution, and declaratory relief as permitted by California law, on behalf of COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

In violation of Labor Code section 247.5, EMPLOYER failed to maintain records documenting the hours worked and paid sick days accrued and used by COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, permitting the presumption that COMPLAINANT and

---

penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty...for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid”).

all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to the maximum number of hours accruable under this article.

Upon information and belief, EMPLOYER further failed and continues to fail to comply with Labor Code section 246, by failing to provide COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a Labor Code section 226 wage statement, or separate writing containing the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays wages.

EMPLOYER unlawfully retained and continues to retain paid sick leave that should have been paid but was not, as a result of EMPLOYER's failure to properly institute a paid sick leave program.

On information and belief, COMPLAINANT alleges that all of these practices were experienced and continue to be experienced by other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

COMPLAINANT requests all appropriate relief under the PAGA and these statutes, including but not limited to the restitution of earned paid sick leave that could have been used, but was not due to EMPLOYER's sole failure to institute such a paid sick leave entitlement or paid sick leave bank as required by California law.

Accordingly, COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to injunctive relief, attorney's fees, declaratory relief, restitution, and penalties as permitted by law. COMPLAINANT requests all relief pursuant to the aforementioned code provisions, including but not limited to Labor Code sections 233 and 234, which incorporates the paid sick leave requirements.

**Failure To Provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave:** Labor Code section 248.2 provides that all employers with 26 or more employees are required to provide up to 80 hours for covered employees to take 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave to care for themselves, to care for a family member or if it is vaccine-related. Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER violated Labor Code section 248.2 by not providing NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with required 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave.

**Refusal to Make Payment:** Labor Code section 216 declares unlawful an employer's refusal to pay wages due and payable and/or denial of the validity of any claim to wages due.

EMPLOYER violated and continues to violate Labor Code section 216 by failing to pay COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked at the proper wage rate and by failing to pay COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of pay for each meal and/or rest period not provided or that was invalid. *Gould v. Maryland Sound Industries, Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1154-1155.

These violations subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code section 225.5. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute's provisions were violated.<sup>7</sup>

**Wage Statement Violations:** California law requires every employer semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing that contains the following: (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; (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. Cal. Lab. Code. section 226(a).

As EMPLOYER failed to provide COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with meal and rest periods that complied with Labor Code section 226.7, the wage statements EMPLOYER issued to COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed and continue to fail to correctly set forth (a) the gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1); (b) the total hours worked by the employee in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2); (c) the net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(5); and (d) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

EMPLOYER's wage statements that it provided to COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES also failed to indicate the earned gross and net wages earned during the pay period, the correct applicable rates of pay for all hours worked, and the "total hours worked" by COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES (by virtue of rounded time entries, automatic deduction for meal periods/failure to relieve NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and employer control during unpaid meal periods, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather than actual hours worked, and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices described above), which results in a violation of Labor Code section 226(a). Failure to list all hours worked on a wage statement, gives rise to an inference of injury under Labor Code Section 226 (*Maldonado v. Epsilon Plastics, Inc.*, (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 1308, 1337).

Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE is being paid.

---

<sup>7</sup> Labor Code § 225.5 (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in violation of sections 212, 216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty...for each failure to pay each employee") (emphasis added).

EMPLOYER's failure to accurately list all hours worked on all wage statements caused confusion to COMPLAINANT and caused and continues to cause confusion to the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES over whether they received all wages owed to them. COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were injured by EMPLOYER's failure to provide accurate wage statements.

In addition, because of the violations detailed above, including but not limited to, not paying regular and overtime wages for all hours worked, not paying all sick leave wages at the proper rates, and failing to provide meal and rest break premiums, EMPLOYER has violated California Labor Code § 226 by willfully failing to furnish COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with accurate, itemized wage statements. As described herein, based on information and belief, EMPLOYER also failed to incorporate all forms of non-discretionary compensation earned during the pay period into the overtime pay rate calculation, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour of overtime worked by COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Moreover, based on information and belief, EMPLOYER issued wage statements to COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that further violate Labor Code section 226(a), by among other things, failing to list the correct name and/or address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result, the wage statements provided to COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not accurate and did not include all of the statutorily required information.

These violations subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code section 226. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.<sup>8</sup>

**Semimonthly Payment Violations:** Labor Code section 204 requires that all earned wages must be paid to employees twice during each calendar month. EMPLOYER violated this section by, including but not limited to, failing to pay COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of pay for meal and rest periods not provided and/or otherwise unlawful, by failing to compensate employees for all hours worked, and by failing to pay proper premium wage rates for all hours worked. These violations subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code section 210. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the statute's provisions were violated.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Lab. Code §226.3 (establishing that the civil penalty is "per employee per violation").

**Violation of Labor Code section 351 and 352:** Labor Code Section 351 prohibits employers and their agents from sharing in or keeping any portion of a gratuity left for or given to one or more employees by a patron. Furthermore, it is illegal for employers to make wage deductions from gratuities, or from using gratuities as direct or indirect credits against an employee's wages. Labor Code Section 353 mandates employers keep accurate records of all gratuities received.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to ensure that NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES fully received the gratuities left for them by patrons, in that EMPLOYER and its agents would collect and/or take a portion of the gratuities for themselves, in violation of Labor Code Section 351. Based on further information and belief, EMPLOYER also failed/fails to keep accurate records of all tips received, in violation of Labor Code Section 353.

Pursuant to PAGA, EMPLOYER is liable for penalties of \$100 per pay period payable to each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for the first violation of Labor Code Section 351 and 353 they experienced within the statutory period, and \$200 per pay period for each additional violation.

**Failure to Provide Suitable Resting Facilities:** Per Section 13 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable resting facilities. Section 13(B) of the Wage Orders provides: "Suitable resting facilities shall be provided in an area separate from the toilet rooms and shall be available to employees during work hours."

EMPLOYER's restaurants/locations are generally similar in layout and design, and there was, and continues to be, space that allows for a resting facility that employees may use to cease work and recover during meal or rest periods. EMPLOYER could have provided COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a resting facility within the restaurant with reasonable or no modification, but instead denied and continues to deny, employees with suitable areas to rest (e.g. a breakroom). As a result, COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were forced to adjust to areas not conducive to resting, including but not limited to leaning up against the restaurant wall.

EMPLOYER did not provide COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with suitable resting facilities during their hours of work, particularly during meal and/or rest periods. Based on information and belief, COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not allowed to sit in the restaurant during working hours, including but not limited to, during rest periods, nor were they provided with a break room. Moreover, EMPLOYER did not inform COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of their rights to suitable resting facilities under California law.

EMPLOYER's failure to provide suitable resting facilities to COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES violated and continues to violate the applicable Wage Order, including but not limited to IWC Wage Order 5-2001, section 13(B) and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

**Seating Violations:** Per section 14(A-B) of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats and when they are not actively engaged in the work duties that would not permit them to be seated.

All applicable IWC Wage Orders, Section 14(A-B) provides:

(A) All working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats.

(B) When employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

Suitable seating is one of the worker protections covered by California's Wage Orders, which have the same dignity as statutes, are remedial in nature and are to be broadly construed to effectuate the goal of protecting the comfort and welfare of employees. *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1027 (2012).

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with suitable seating, and when such employees were not engaged in duties which required them to stand, no seating was placed in reasonable proximity to their workstations.

Moreover, based on information and belief, the nature of the work reasonably permitted the use of seats for at least part of the time that NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were working. Lastly, based on information and belief, there were periods of time when NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not engaged in active duties of their employment, yet there were no suitable seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and use of seats would not interfere with the performance of their duties.

EMPLOYER's NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked in various positions, such as, but not limited to, cooks, prep cooks, servers, bussers, food runners, dish washers, and/or other similar titles. The nature of COMPLAINANT's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work reasonably permitted the use of seats. However, EMPLOYER failed to provide suitable seating in reasonable proximity to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work areas in violation of section 14(A-B) of all applicable Wage Orders, and Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199, subjecting EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1199 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and IWC Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period").

**Standard Conditions of Labor Violations:** Together, Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199 make unlawful any employment of any employee under conditions of labor prohibited by the Wage Orders, and any violation, refusal, or neglect to comply with any provision within Part 4, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code, including sections 1174, 1197, and 1198, or order or ruling of the commission.

Therefore, EMPLOYER's violations, including but not limited to, with respect to meal periods, rest periods, recordkeeping provisions, minimum wages and overtime wages, suitable seating, suitable resting facilities, and business expenses, result in separate violations of sections 1198 and 1199, which subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1197.1 and 2699.

**Statutory Wage Violations:** Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for an employer to secretly pay wages lower than required by statute while purporting to pay legal wages.

As described above, EMPLOYER willfully and systematically denied COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of minimum and overtime wage compensation for all hours worked which resulted in the payment of less than statutorily required wages owed to them. EMPLOYER acted with the intent to deprive them of statutory wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages and minimum wages, to which they were entitled to under California law.

Thus, EMPLOYER paid COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES lower wages than those they were entitled to while purporting that COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were properly paid. As such, COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to recover penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f)-(g).

**Failure to Pay Vested Vacation/Paid Time Off:**

California Labor Code section 227.3 provides that when an employer policy provides for paid vacations and/or paid time off, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his, her, or their vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to the employee as wages at the employee's final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served and that there shall be no forfeiture of vested vacation time or paid time off upon termination. Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER had and continues to have a uniform policy and practice of failing to allow NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to use their earned vacation/paid time off during their employment and failing to pay all vested, accrued paid time off to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES upon separation of employment, in violation of California law, including but not limited to, Labor Code section 227.3.

**Final Pay Violations:** Labor Code section 201 requires employers to pay all wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, immediately upon discharge. California Labor Code section 201(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." California Labor Code section

202(a) provides, in relevant part, that “[i]f an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.” Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, an employer that willfully fails to pay wages due an employee who is terminated or resigns must pay (in addition to the unpaid wages) a penalty equal to the employee's daily wages for each day, not exceeding 30 days, that the wages are unpaid. This 30-day waiting time penalty is recoverable under the PAGA via Labor Code Section 256. See, *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014); see also, *Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 134 Cal. App. 4th 365 (2005).

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER failed to timely pay NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages that were due and owing upon termination or resignation. Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER untimely provides final wages to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES without regard to the timing requirements of Labor Code sections 201-202.

Upon separation of employment, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ final paychecks were not timely provided and/or were not timely provided with all owed vacation pay and/or paid time off. Moreover, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ final paychecks, once provided, did not include all wages owed as they were devoid of, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, all owed sick leave and/or paid time off wages at the properly accrued rates.

These violations subject EMPLOYER to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 203, 210, and/or 256. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.<sup>10</sup>

**Business Expense Violations:** California law requires employers to indemnify their employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to the directions of the employer. See Cal. Lab. Code § 2802(a) and all applicable Wage Orders, § 9 (b). Furthermore, “for purposes of [section 2802], the term ‘necessary expenditure or losses’ shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorneys’ fees incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section.”

Among other things, under California law, when tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and

---

<sup>10</sup> (establishing that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty...for each failure to pay each employee”).

equipment customarily required by the trade or craft. See applicable IWC Wage Order, § 9 (b).

Among other things, under California law, when employees must use their personal cellphones for work-related purposes, the employer must reimburse them for a reasonable percentage of their cell phone bills. See *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Services, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140. To show liability, an employee will only need to show that he or she was required to use their personal cellphone for work-related purposes and not reimbursed for the use. *Id.* 1144-1145. California law also requires employers to reimburse employees for automobile expenses incurred for the business use of personal vehicles, such as for mileage, gas, and the wear and tear on the vehicle. See *Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 554. Further, "any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled to under the laws of this State." See Cal. Lab. Code § 2804.

Based on information and belief, COMPLAINANT and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were improperly required to provide and maintain work tools that are supposed to be the responsibility of the employer.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER shifted its costs of doing business onto NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by requiring them to pay for its business expenses, including but not limited to, uniforms and/or the use of NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' personal mobile phone and data usage for work related purposes including but not limited to receiving and responding to work related messages and/or phone calls. Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not reimbursed for the cost of using their personal phone for work related purposes and/or the cost of purchasing and/or maintaining work uniforms/clothing/safety/protective equipment. For example, based on information and belief, at times, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES received calls/messages to their personal cell phones/mobile devices from supervisors regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks but were not provided any reimbursement from EMPLOYER for this personal cell phone use. Additionally, COMPLAINANT was required to purchase and/or maintain his own work clothing/uniforms and/or work shoes, such as, but not limited to, pants and shirts, without being provided any reimbursement from EMPLOYER for the expenses he incurred in connection therewith.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were improperly required to pay for business expenses that are supposed to be the responsibility of EMPLOYER.

As a pattern and practice, EMPLOYER regularly failed to reimburse and indemnify NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2802, COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT

AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to be reimbursed for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out EMPLOYER's orders and/or carrying out the duties assigned by EMPLOYER.

As described herein, EMPLOYER regularly failed to reimburse and indemnify COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their job duties. EMPLOYER's failure to provide COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with full reimbursement for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required that COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES subsidize and/or carry the burden of business expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

**Unlawful Agreements/ Unlawful Criminal History Inquiries:**

**Unlawful Agreements**

Labor Code section 432.5 provides that "no employer...shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer...to be prohibited by law." Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER required COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to unlawful conditions of employment including but not limited to unlawful criminal and/or financial checks as a condition of obtaining and/or continuing employment in violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

The California Labor Code places certain procedural and substantive limits on employers' ability to conduct employee background checks and on how employers can use the information they obtain through those background checks. Labor Code section 1024.5 states that employers, except for financial institutions, may order a credit check only if the individual works (or is applying to work) in certain positions (e.g., managerial positions, financially-related positions, and certain government positions). Additionally, the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act (ICRAA- CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq.*) and the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA - 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.*) mandate several requirements prior to and following an employee background check, including but not limited to identifying an appropriate reason for the background check, a separate consent form with required disclosures and certain formatting requirements, additional forms such as a summary of rights, a way by which to request a copy of the report, as well as proper notice of adverse actions taken, among other statutory requirements.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER ordered unlawful financial credit checks on NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of Labor Code section 1024.5, and required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to provide ongoing written consent to the unlawful credit checks as a condition of employment, in violation of California and Federal law, which results in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER also required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to submit and/or agree to submit in writing to unlawful criminal background checks as a condition of obtaining and/or holding employment in violation of the ICRAA and the FCRA.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to a background check which failed to abide by the requirements set forth in CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq.* and 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.*, including but not limited to by failing to provide a clear and conspicuous disclosure (and/or failing to provide any disclosure at all), failing to provide disclosures free of extraneous information, failing to provide a lawful purpose for the background check, failing to provide a summary of rights under the ICRAA and/or the FCRA, failing to provide a way by which the individual could request a copy of the report, failing to disclose the name, address, and telephone number of the third party preparing the report, and failing to properly obtain authorization or consent to such a background check, and thus was an unlawful background check.

By requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to unlawful criminal and/or financial checks not in conformance with the applicable laws, EMPLOYER violated Labor Code section 432.5.

Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER also required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to provide ongoing consent to EMPLOYER to conduct background checks throughout the duration of employment, in violation of the ICRAA and/or FCRA and/or other applicable laws, resulting in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5, by requiring applicants and employees to agree to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment.

Based on further information and belief, EMPLOYER knew that requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree to unlawful criminal and/or financial background checks as a condition of obtaining and/or holding employment was unlawful.

By requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES agree in writing to unlawful provisions as a condition of employment, EMPLOYER violated Labor Code section 432.5.

#### Unlawful Inquires into Criminal History

Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits an employer from asking applicants about past arrest(s) unless they resulted in conviction(s) and even then, certain limitations apply. Based on information and belief, EMPLOYER asked NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES about arrests not resulting in convictions on its employment application, in violation of California law.

Upon information and belief, EMPLOYER, in violation of California law, including but not limited to the Fair Chance Act/the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (“FEHA”), asked

NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES about convictions prior to extending an offer of employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired into criminal history on its employment application in violation of California law.

By asking about arrests not resulting in convictions, EMPLOYER violated Labor Code section 432.7. By asking about convictions at the application phase or prior to extending an employment offer, EMPLOYER violated California's Fair Chance Act, and thereby violated Labor Code section 432.5 by unlawfully requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to disclose arrests and/or convictions as a condition of employment.

As such, COMPLAINANT, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES continue to be subject to various unlawful provisions as a condition of employment.

### **Conclusion**

EMPLOYER has violated the above-referenced California Labor Code provisions, the applicable IWC Wage Order, including but not limited to all applicable Wage Orders, as well as other laws, and is liable for all applicable premium wages, statutory and civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs. The civil penalties COMPLAINANT and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES seek to recover include, but are not limited to, the statutory and civil penalties specified above.

Labor Code § 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter (i.e. this NOTICE) to the employer in question and file an online claim to the LWDA setting forth the claims and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the LWDA an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this NOTICE is to satisfy the requirements created by Labor Code §§ 2699, 2699.3(a), 2699.3(b), 2699.3(c), and 2699.5, prior to seeking penalties and premium wages allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations in a civil action. We look forward to determining whether the LWDA intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly ask that you respond to this NOTICE according to the time frame contemplated by the code.

If the LWDA elects not to take any action with respect to any of the foregoing claims, COMPLAINANT will seek these penalties in a civil action, on behalf of COMPLAINANT and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of EMPLOYER within one year of the date of this letter as allowed by law.

Please advise if your office intends to investigate any of the factual and legal allegations and provide notice within sixty-five days of the date of this NOTICE to our office and to that of other charged parties. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address below:

Kiara Bramasco  
Crosner Legal, PC  
9440 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 301  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210  
Main: 310.496.5818  
Fax: 310.510.6429  
Email: [kiara@crosnerlegal.com](mailto:kiara@crosnerlegal.com)

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kiara Bramasco".

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.  
CROSNER LEGAL, PC