

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
E-mail: kane.moon@moonyanglaw.com
Enzo Nabiev (SBN 332118)
E-mail: enzo.nabiev@moonyanglaw.com
MOON & YANG, APC
1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff Janete Jones

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

JANETE JONES, individually, and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NOAH'S NEW YORK BAGELS COMPANY, a
Minnesota corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: **23CV413369**

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

1. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab.
Code § 2699, et seq.]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants Noah’s New York Bagels Company
6 and Does 1 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for civil penalties under the
7 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* (“PAGA”)
8 stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay for all hours worked (including minimum wages,
9 straight time wages, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize
10 and permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal
11 periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, and failure to furnish
12 accurate wage statements.

13 2. For over 50 years, California’s courts and legislature have recognized that this
14 State’s wage-and-hour laws serve a compelling public interest of fostering a stable job market.
15 Wages are not ordinary debts. Because of the economic position of the average worker and
16 his or her family, it is essential to the public welfare that employers obey the wage-and-hour
17 laws so that employees are promptly paid the minimum/overtime wages that the Legislature
18 has required for employees. So fundamental are California’s wage-and-hour laws that the
19 Legislature has criminalized certain types of violations. In extending extra protection to deter
20 violations of these underlying statutes—since Plaintiff is not seeking general and/or special
21 damages, restitution or other damages other than civil penalties—California has enacted the
22 PAGA to permit an individual to bring an action on behalf of himself and on behalf of others
23 for PAGA penalties only, which is the precise and sole nature of this action.

24 3. All California employees during the relevant statutes of limitations who are or were
25 harmed by Defendant’s illegal practices are “Aggrieved Employees.”

26 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties for
27 himself, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of
28 the State of California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as

1 permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory
2 violations are mentioned for wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or
3 special damages for those violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor
4 Code Section 2699, declaratory relief, and injunctive relief for himself and all aggrieved
5 employees as permitted by the PAGA.

6 5. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
7 establishment within the State of California, including Riverside County. As such, and based
8 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California,
9 Defendants are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial
10 Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

11 6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants maintained
12 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 13 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
14 wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the
15 California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- 16 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
17 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
18 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and
19 failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period
20 violation occurred;
- 21 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
22 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
23 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
24 period violation occurred;
- 25 (d) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours employees worked;
- 26 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all meal period, rest period, minimum
27 wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages due within the time period
28 specified by California law when employment terminates; and

(f) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

7. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

8. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

9. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Santa Clara, State of California, as a baker from approximately March 2022 to May 2022.

B. Defendants

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Noah's New York Bagels Company is:

- (a) A Minnesota corporation with its principal place of business in Santa Clara, California.
- (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Santa Clara County;
- (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of the Aggrieved Employees. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued

1 herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names.
2 Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered
3 by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this
4 complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been
5 ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

6 12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
7 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,
8 and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the State
9 of California.

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

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

24 14. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Santa
25 Clara, State of California, as a baker during the statutory period. During the statutory time
26 period, Plaintiff was typically scheduled to work at least 5 days in a workweek, and typically
27 in excess of 8 hours in a single workday.
28

1 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
2 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
3 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
4 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all
5 final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to
6 furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience
7 working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

8 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
9 not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime
10 wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and
11 uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees performed pre-shift
12 duties, such as turning off the alarm in the morning. Also, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
13 Employees were required to use their own personal cellular telephones for work purposes,
14 while off the clock, including to communicate with supervisors.

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

27 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
28 and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods.

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

16 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the
17 Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for
18 Defendants without reimbursement, such as the use of personal cellular telephones for work
19 purposes, such as to communicate with other employees/supervisors, and to use the calculator
20 function. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to purchase shirts for
21 work, and to maintain (launder) those uniforms, without reimbursement.

22 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
23 pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all wages
24 for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period
25 premium wages. Further, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees their
26 final paychecks immediately upon termination.

1 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants filed to provide adequate and suitable
2 seating to its employees, despite the fact that seating was possible for its employees
3 throughout the workday. This was particularly true during COVID times in 2020.

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

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

- 1 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
2 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
3 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
4 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
5 statements contained the required accurate information;
- 6 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to
7 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,
8 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- 9 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
10 rates to which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and
11 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and
12 wage rates to which they were entitled.

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

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
17 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

18 23. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs as
19 though fully set forth herein.

20 24. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
21 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

22 25. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
23 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of
24 law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by
25 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions,
26 commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an
27 alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of
28 himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified

1 in Section 2699.3.”

2 26. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
3 Code § 2699.3. On December 25, 2022 she gave written notice by online filing to the Labor
4 and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific
5 provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and
6 former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations.
7 Plaintiff also paid the filing fee shortly after December 25, 2022. Plaintiff’s PAGA case
8 number is LWDA-CM-926052-22.

9 27. The statute of limitations is tolled while a plaintiff exhausts his/her administrative
10 remedies with California’s Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) prior to suit,
11 which is required by the statute. (See Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(d).)

12 28. More than 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and
13 Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’
14 Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil
15 action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of
16 the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to,
17 penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

18 29. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California Labor
19 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any
20 entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required
21 by California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the
22 applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the
23 employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall
24 also be recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every
25 employer shall keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

26 30. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
27 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing
28 to maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when

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

14 31. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award
15 of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved
16 Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an
17 amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other
18 remedies permitted by law.

19 32. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs
20 pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action
21 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

22 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

23 Plaintiff, on behalf of all similarly aggrieved employees, prays for relief and judgment
24 against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

25 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
26 Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and
27 overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods,
28

1 failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours
2 worked and meal periods;

3 2. An award of civil penalties on behalf of himself and all similarly aggrieved
4 employees pursuant to PAGA;

5 3. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;

6 4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;

7 5. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and

8 6. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.

9
10 Dated: March 31, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

11 MOON & YANG, APC

12
13 By: 

Kane Moon

Enzo Nabiev

Attorneys for Plaintiff

14
15
16 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

18
19 Dated: March 31, 2023

MOON & YANG, APC

20
21 By: 

Kane Moon

Enzo Nabiev

Attorneys for Plaintiff