

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

12/15/2022 at 04:41:52 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Kristin Sorianosos, Deputy Clerk

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Kristina Bui Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 294924]
kristina@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513
Riverside, CA 92504
Tel: (951) 320-1444 | Fax: (951) 320-1445

MALATESTA LAW
Andrew J. Malatesta (State Bar No. 286344)
16501 Ventura Blvd., Suite 400
Encino, CA 91436
Telephone: (424) 284-1384 | Facsimile: (424) 284-8170
AJM@Malatesta-Law.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

LUIS CABALLERO, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMERICAN METAL FILTER COMPANY,
a California Corporation; and DOES 1
through 20, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 37-2022-00050163-CU-OE-CTL

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE
COMPLAINT**

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (6) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (7) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
- (8) Unfair and Unlawful Competition;

PAGA CLAIMS

- (9) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (10) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (11) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (12) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (13) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (14) Failure to Timely Pay Wages;
- (15) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages; and
- (16) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

1 Plaintiff Luis Caballero (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and
2 on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action against his former employer(s), Defendants American
5 Metal Filter Company and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively, “Defendants”) on behalf
6 of all current and former nonexempt employees employed by Defendants in California (the
7 “Class” or “Represented Employees”), for Labor Code violations stemming from Defendants’
8 failure to pay all wages owed, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to
9 provide meal periods, failure to provide rest breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses,
10 failure to timely pay wages each period and upon separation of employment, and failure to
11 provide accurate itemized wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately August 2020 through
13 November 2022.

14 3. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Represented Employees were
15 subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations
16 to which Plaintiff was subjected during employment.

17 4. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
18 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
19 worked.

20 5. Additionally, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Represented Employees to
21 frequently work in excess of 8 and/or 12 hours per day, and/or 40 hours per week, without proper
22 overtime compensation. As one specific example, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees often
23 worked ten-hour shifts, four days per week, without receiving any overtime compensation.

24 6. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were also denied the 30-minute off-duty
25 meal periods that they were entitled to pursuant to California law. As a result of Defendants’
26 policies and practices, the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations
27 when they were: (1) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty
28 meal period while under the control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period,

1 (4) forced to take a meal period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated
2 second meal periods for shifts in excess of 10 hours.

3 7. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Represented Employees with
4 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
5 mandated by California law. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were often not authorized
6 and/or permitted to take rest breaks that were off-duty, that were within the requisite time period,
7 and/or did not receive additional rest periods they were entitled to for additional time worked.
8 Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees worked longer shifts,
9 Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit mandated third or fourth rest breaks.

10 8. Moreover, at all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Represented
11 Employees to incur necessary business-related expenses and costs without reimbursement. For
12 example, Plaintiff was required to acquire and maintain the necessary tools and gear to perform
13 his welding duties.

14 9. Plaintiff also alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
15 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
16 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
17 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
18 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
19 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, wage premiums, among others.

20 10. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
21 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

22 11. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' violations of the wage and hour components of
23 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their
24 level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over
25 its competitors.

26 12. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
27 Represented Employees' employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees'
28 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be

1 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
2 hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
3 underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

4 13. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, injunctive, equitable, and
5 monetary relief against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of himself and the Represented
6 Employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys' fees,
7 penalties, costs and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208,
8 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2802,
9 among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the right to name
10 additional representatives throughout the State of California.

11 **II. JURISDICTION**

12 14. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the
13 Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

14 **III. VENUE**

15 15. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil
16 Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in San Diego County and the unlawful acts
17 alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in San Diego
18 County. Furthermore, Defendants employed or employ Plaintiff and Represented Employees in
19 San Diego County.

20 **IV. PARTIES**

21 **Plaintiff**

22 16. Plaintiff and Class Representative Luis Caballero was employed by Defendants
23 from approximately August 2020 through November 2022 and performed work for Defendants
24 in San Diego County.

25 **Defendants**

26 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant American
27 Metal Filter Company is a California corporation authorized to and doing business in San Diego
28 County, State of California. Plaintiff is also informed and believes that Defendant American

1 Metal Filter Company is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Represented
2 Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

3 18. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of
4 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20,
5 inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for
6 the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Represented Employees by virtue of
7 Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious
8 names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE
9 Defendants when ascertained.

10 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he and the Represented
11 Employees worked under the joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and
12 each of them, acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants,
13 carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of
14 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a
15 unity of interest and ownership between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as
16 a single employer of Plaintiff and other Represented Employees.

17 20. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
18 Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single
19 employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human
20 resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally,
21 Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor
22 operations, and common ownership or financial control.

23 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting
24 themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active
25 concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in
26 all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times
27 Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the
28 agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining

co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of their remaining co-Defendants.

22. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly, the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege, thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

24. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a class action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

25. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

26. The Class, also referred to as the “Represented Employees,” that Plaintiff seeks to represent is defined as follows:

All current and former nonexempt employees employed by
Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.

27. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

Meal Break Subclass

All Represented Employees who worked a shift in excess of
5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

///

///

1 **Rest Break Subclass**

2 All Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least
3 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

4 **Unreimbursed Expense Subclass**

5 All Represented Employees who were required to incur
6 expenses to discharge their duties for Defendants without
7 reimbursement during the Relevant Time Period.

8 **Waiting Time Penalties Subclass**

9 All Represented Employees who separated from their
10 employment with Defendants during the period three years
11 before the filing of this action and ending when final
12 judgment is entered.

13 **Wage Statement Penalties Subclass**

14 All Represented Employees during the period one year
15 before the filing of this action and ending when final
16 judgment is entered.

17 28. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class description with greater
18 specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues as appropriate.

19 29. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that he
20 seeks to represent.

21 30. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
22 under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the
23 litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

24 31. **Numerosity:** The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that
25 a joinder of all Represented Employees is impracticable. Although the exact number is currently
26 unknown to Plaintiff, this information is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

27 ///

28 ///

1 32. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which
2 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including
3 without limitation:

4 i. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
5 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all
6 hours worked;

7 ii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
8 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
9 Employees for hours above 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week;

10 iii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
11 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Meal Break
12 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
13 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a compliant
14 meal period was not provided;

15 iv. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
16 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Rest Break
17 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass
18 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a paid rest
19 break was not provided;

20 v. Whether Defendants violated the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage
21 Order by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for business
22 expenses incurred discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of their employer;

23 vi. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
24 timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment between Defendants and Plaintiff and
25 the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass, whether such separation was voluntary or involuntary;

26 vii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
27 provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized
28 wage statements;

viii. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, and failure to timely pay final wages; and

ix. Whether Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

33. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims, as the Class Representative, are typical of the claims of The Class. Plaintiff, like other members of The Class, was subjected to Defendants' ongoing Labor Code and Wage Order violations including pertaining to the failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

34. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff, as the Class Representative, will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's interests are not in conflict with those of the Class. Class Representative's counsel are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions and other complex litigation matters, including cases like this case.

35. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

///

///

///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

4 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

5 36. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
6 alleged herein.

7 37. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement
8 to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for
9 each hour worked.

10 38. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided proper minimum and
11 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
12 worked.

13 39. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
14 the Represented Employees for all hours worked.

15 40. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
16 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
17 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

18 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
19 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
20 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

21 42. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
22 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each
23 hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay
24 them in accordance thereto.

25 43. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
26 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
27 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
28 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California

1 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

2 44. During employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
3 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

4 45. As a result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
5 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

6 46. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
7 all unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs of
8 suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1194.2, against Defendants in an amount to be proven
9 at trial.

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

12 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

13 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

14 47. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
15 alleged herein.

16 48. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were employees of Defendants who did
17 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

18 49. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
19 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
20 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
21 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
22 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
23 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

24 50. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required by
25 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week, without proper
26 overtime compensation.

27 51. As one specific example, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees often worked
28 ten-hour shifts, four days per week, without receiving any overtime compensation.

1 52. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
2 the Represented Employees for all overtime hours worked.

3 53. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
4 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees because
5 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
6 week without proper overtime compensation.

7 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
8 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
9 Represented Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

10 55. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
11 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid proper overtime wages throughout the statutory
12 period, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

13 56. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
14 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
15 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
16 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
17 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

18 57. During the employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
19 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

20 58. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
21 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

22 59. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
23 all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against
24 Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 66. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
2 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not provided with all
3 mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass one
4 additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

5 67. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Meal
6 Break Subclass all mandated meal periods and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
7 meal or rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

8 68. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass did not
9 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
10 obtained from Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not willfully obtained, were not
11 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
12 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
13 to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

14 69. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
15 periods as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of
16 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
17 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
18 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal period was not
19 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

20 70. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
21 and IWC Wage Order § 11, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Meal
22 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

23 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

25 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

26 *Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

27 71. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
28 alleged herein.

1 72. Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
2 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

3 73. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
4 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

5 74. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
6 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
7 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
8 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
9 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

10 75. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
11 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
12 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

13 76. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
14 Break Subclass with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
15 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. The Rest Break Subclass and the Rest Break
16 Subclass were often not authorized and/or permitted to take rest breaks that were off-duty, that
17 were within the requisite time period, and/or did not receive additional rest periods they were
18 entitled to for additional time worked.

19 77. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
20 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were not provided with all
21 mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
22 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

23 78. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
24 Break Subclass all mandated rest breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
25 rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

26 79. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with rest breaks
27 as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of each rest
28 break not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage

1 Order § 12. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at the
2 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a paid rest break was not
3 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

4 80. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
5 and IWC Wage Order § 12, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Rest
6 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

7 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

9 (Labor Code § 2802)

10 *Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass Against All Defendants*

11 81. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
12 alleged herein.

13 82. Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass are and/or were employees of
14 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing
15 reimbursement of business expenses.

16 83. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
17 expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of
18 their employer.

19 84. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants
20 required Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass to incur necessary business-related
21 expenses and costs without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff was required to acquire and
22 maintain the necessary tools and gear to perform his welding duties.

23 85. At all relevant times herein, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they
24 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for expenses incurred as a
25 direct consequence of employment with Defendants and/or under the direction of Defendants.

26 86. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to reimburse the Unreimbursed
27 Expense Subclass, including Plaintiff, for expenses incurred while discharging duties to
28 Defendants, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

87. As a direct result of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 2802 and IWC Wage Order § 9(B), Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass have suffered, and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to such incurred expenses, expenses, and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their obligations under the law, all in an amount to be proved at time of trial.

89. Furthermore, Labor Code § 2802(c) states that “[f]or the purposes of this section, the term 'necessary expenditures or losses' shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorney’s fees incurred by the employee in enforcing the rights granted by this section.” Therefore, Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass seek to recover the unreimbursed expenses, interest on the unreimbursed expenses, and the costs and attorney’s fees necessarily incurred in pursuing same. The exact amount of reimbursements, interest, costs, and attorney’s fees will be in an amount to be proved at the time of trial.

Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass against All Defendants

91. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing and payment of wages.

1 92. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
2 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

3 93. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
4 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
5 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

6 94. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
7 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
8 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

9 95. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby
10 Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass were not paid all wages due and owing upon
11 separation of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

12 96. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all
13 wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass upon separation of
14 employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as
15 meal and rest period premiums.

16 97. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
17 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass all
18 wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and
19 202. Consequently, pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendants owe Plaintiff and the Waiting
20 Time Penalties Subclass the above-described waiting time penalty, all in an amount to be shown
21 according to proof at trial and within the jurisdiction of this Court.

22 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

24 (Labor Code § 226)

25 *Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass against All Defendants*

26 98. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
27 alleged herein.

28 ///

1 99. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
2 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
3 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

4 100. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
5 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
6 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
7 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
8 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
9 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

10 101. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
11 and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass due to violations including: failure to accurately state
12 gross wages; failure to accurately state all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages
13 earned; failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay);
14 and failure to accurately state the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

15 102. Additionally, Defendants' wage statements directly violated Labor Code § 226(a)
16 each period due to the failure to pay and report premium wages for denied meal periods and rest
17 breaks under § 226.7.

18 103. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
19 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a
20 wage statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
21 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

22 104. Defendants' failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the
23 Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the
24 calculation and rate of pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore,
25 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting
26 miscalculation of wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said
27 Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered
28 and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost

1 interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully
2 perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to
3 proof at trial.

4 105. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
5 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered an injury in
6 that each was prevented from knowing, understanding and disputing the wage payments paid to
7 them. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have each suffered an
8 injury in that the failure to show all wages earned on the itemized wage statements resulted in
9 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees being denied all necessary deductions, payments, and
10 withholdings owed by the employer, including, but not limited to, the failure to make all
11 necessary contributions for unemployment benefits, social security benefits, proper payment of
12 taxes and withholdings, and other mandated state and federal benefits.

13 106. Plaintiff has also been injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt
14 to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the
15 mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

16 107. Labor Code § 226(e) requires Defendants to pay the greater of all actual damages
17 or fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and
18 one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods, plus
19 attorney's fees and costs, to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass who were
20 injured by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a). The exact amount of the
21 applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

22 **EIGHT CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION**

24 (Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*)

25 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees against All Defendants*

26 108. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
27 alleged herein.

28 ///

1 109. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair
2 competition, which includes any “unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.” The
3 Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact,
4 due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

5 110. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under Business &
6 Professions Code § 17021.

7 111. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California’s wage
8 and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide
9 mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses, and failure to
10 timely pay wages upon separation of employment, all to decrease their costs and increase profits.

11 112. At all times relevant herein, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Represented
12 Employees wages and monies and other financial obligations to which they were entitled.

13 113. As a result of Defendants’ failure to comply with the Labor Code and IWC
14 Orders, Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, suffered a loss of wages and monies, all in
15 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. Defendants’ ongoing violations of the
16 foregoing statutes and laws constitute a violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*

17 114. Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders and
18 its scheme to lower its payroll costs as alleged herein, constitute unlawful and unfair business
19 practices because it was done in a systematic manner over a period of time to the detriment of the
20 Plaintiff and all others similarly-situated.

21 115. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
22 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
23 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
24 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

25 116. A violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* may be
26 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
27 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, are
28 unlawful and in violation of public policy, and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive,

1 fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
2 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

3 117. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has no plain,
4 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which they have suffered as a
5 consequence of Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of
6 the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
7 and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
8 harm unless Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
9 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

10 118. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is entitled to,
11 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge the profits which Defendants have
12 acquired, or of which Plaintiff and Represented Employees have been deprived, by means of the
13 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the
14 Represented Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the unfair
15 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

16 119. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
17 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
18 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining Defendants, and each of them, from
19 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in
20 the future.

21 120. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and
22 Represented Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
23 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
24 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and
25 Represented Employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil
26 Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **VI. LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CAUSES OF ACTION**
2 **(Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)**

3 121. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as he was employed by
4 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
5 violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil
6 action filed on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved
7 employees in California against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed
8 (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

9 122. Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to
10 Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by
11 PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court
12 in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Therefore, Plaintiff is not required to, nor
13 does she, seek class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

14 123. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff is in the process of providing
15 written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and
16 by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been
17 violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

18 124. Therefore, once more than sixty-five (65) days have passed since the date wherein
19 Plaintiff gave notice, Plaintiff will have fully satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit
20 under the PAGA and this Complaint will be deemed amended to include the PAGA allegations
21 enumerated below. Once this occurs, Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available
22 PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or other
23 damages as permitted by PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the
24 California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Plaintiff is not
25 required to, nor does he, seek class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil
26 Procedure § 382.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 125. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
6 alleged herein.

7 126. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to
8 be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each
9 hour worked.

10 127. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and
11 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
12 worked.

13 128. As a result of this policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the
14 Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked.

15 129. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
16 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
17 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

18 130. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
19 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
20 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

21 131. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
22 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
23 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 132. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
6 alleged herein.

7 133. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did
8 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

9 134. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
10 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
11 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
12 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
13 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
14 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

15 135. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by
16 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. As one specific
17 example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees often worked ten-hour shifts, four days per
18 week, without receiving any overtime compensation.

19 136. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
20 the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked.

21 137. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
22 the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked.

23 138. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
24 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because
25 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
26 week without proper overtime compensation.

27 ///

28 ///

1 139. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
2 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
3 Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

4 140. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
5 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
6 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

7 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS**

9 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

10 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

11 141. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
12 alleged herein.

13 142. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
14 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
15 periods.

16 143. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
17 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

18 144. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
19 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
20 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
21 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
22 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
23 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
24 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

25 145. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
26 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
27 pay for each meal period that is missed.

28 ///

1 146. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were denied
2 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
3 practices, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were subjected to meal period violations when
4 they were: (1) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal
5 period while under the control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4)
6 forced to take a meal period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated second
7 meal periods for shifts in excess of 10 hours.

8 147. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
9 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
10 all mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
11 one additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

12 148. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
13 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
14 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
15 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
16 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
17 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

18 149. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
19 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
20 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

21 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

23 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

24 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

25 150. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
26 alleged herein.

27 151. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
28 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

1 152. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
2 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

3 153. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
4 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
5 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
6 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
7 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

8 154. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
9 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
10 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

11 155. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
12 Break Subclass with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
13 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. The Rest Break Subclass and the Rest Break
14 Subclass were often not authorized and/or permitted to take rest breaks that were off-duty, that
15 were within the requisite time period, and/or did not receive additional rest periods they were
16 entitled to for additional time worked.

17 156. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
18 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
19 all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
20 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

21 157. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
22 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
23 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

3 (Labor Code § 2802)

4 *Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass Against All Defendants*

5 158. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
6 alleged herein.

7 159. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
8 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing reimbursement of
9 business expenses.

10 160. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
11 expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of
12 their employer.

13 161. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants
14 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business-related expenses and
15 costs without reimbursement including necessary tools and gear to perform their job duties.

16 162. At all relevant times herein, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they
17 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for expenses incurred as a direct
18 consequence of employment with Defendants and/or under the direction of Defendants.

19 163. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
20 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
21 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

22 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

24 (Labor Code § 204)

25 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

26 164. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
27 alleged herein.

28 ///

1 165. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “nonexempt” employees
2 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the
3 timing of payment of wages each period.

4 166. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
5 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
6 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
7 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
8 the following month.

9 167. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states “[t]he requirements of this section shall
10 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
11 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.”

12 168. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the
13 Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each period within the time required by
14 Labor Code § 204. Moreover, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited to,
16 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums, within the
17 time specified by Labor Code § 204.

18 169. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
19 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
20 and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

21 **FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

23 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 and 256)

24 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

25 170. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
26 alleged herein.

27 ///

28 ///

1 171. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “non-exempt” employees
2 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
3 timing and payment of final wages.

4 172. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
5 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

6 173. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
7 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
8 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

9 174. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
10 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
11 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

12 175. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
13 Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not
14 limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums,
15 within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

16 176. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
17 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
18 due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

19 177. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
20 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
21 and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

22 **SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

24 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

25 (Labor Code § 226)

26 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

27 178. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
28 alleged herein.

1 179. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
2 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of
3 accurate itemized wage statements.

4 180. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
5 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
6 inclusive dates of the pay period, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period
7 and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

8 181. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
9 and the Aggrieved Employees because due to violations including: failure to accurately state
10 gross wages; failure to accurately state all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages
11 earned; failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay);
12 and failure to accurately state the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

13 182. Additionally, Defendants' wage statements directly violated Labor Code § 226(a)
14 each period due to the failure to pay and report premium wages for denied meal periods and rest
15 breaks under § 226.7.

16 183. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
17 to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants failed to provide a wage statement
18 to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees that complied with the requirements of Labor Code §
19 226(a).

20 184. As a result of the Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff seeks
21 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
22 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.
23 See *Raines v. Coastal Pacific Food Distributors, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 667, 675 ("Section
24 226.3 provides the civil penalty for failure to comply" with Labor Code § 226).

25 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

26 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and all others
27 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
28 follows:

1. That the First through Eighth Causes of Action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;
4. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Eighth Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
5. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;
6. For injunctive relief and/or restitution as provided by the Labor Code and Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;
7. As to the Ninth through Sixteenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all applicable and available remedies under the PAGA;
8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under the PAGA;
9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2802, among other sections inadvertently omitted;
10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties according to proof, including interest thereon;
11. For pre- and post-judgment interest; and
12. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby demands a jury trial as to the First through Eighth Causes of Action pled herein.

Dated: December 15, 2022

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

BY:



Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
Kristina Bui Carlson, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff