

02/07/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: R. Lozano Deputy

1 Rana Nader (SBN 247182)
2 nader@proxylawfirm.com
3 Hengameh S. Safaei (SBN 248048)
4 safaei@proxylawfirm.com
5 **PROXY LAW FIRM LLP**
6 10880 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1101
7 Los Angeles, California 90024
8 Telephone: (310) 853-8333
9 Facsimile: (310) 861-5931

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff JULIO CESAR MARTINEZ RODRIGUEZ,
11 individually and on behalf of others similarly situated

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

13 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT

14 JULIO CESAR MARTINEZ RODRIGUEZ,
15 individually and on behalf of all others similarly
16 situated,

17 PLAINTIFF,

18 v.

19 DVD FACTORY, INC., a California
20 corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

21 DEFENDANTS.

CASE NO.: 22STCV38588

*Assigned For All Purposes to Judge David S.
Cunningham III*

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT
FOR:**

- 1) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME (LABOR CODE §§ 510, 1198)
- 2) FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND/OR PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS (LABOR CODE § 226.7, 512)
- 3) FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST BREAKS AND/OR PAY REST BREAK PREMIUMS (LABOR CODE § 226.7)
- 4) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES (LABOR CODE §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1)
- 5) FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES (LABOR CODE §§ 201-203)
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLETE AND ACCURATE WAGE STATEMENTS (LABOR CODE § 226)
- 7) UCL VIOLATIONS (BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200-17204);
- 8) PENALTIES PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT (LABOR CODE §§ 2698 – 2699.5)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1
2 Plaintiff Julio Cesar Martinez Rodriguez (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of others
3 similarly situated (hereinafter “Class Members”), and as a private attorney general, based upon facts
4 that either have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable
5 opportunity for further investigation and discovery, complains and hereby alleges as follows:

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants DVD FACTORY, INC., a California
8 corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (hereinafter also collectively referred to as
9 “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations, unfair business practices, and monetary penalties
10 stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay overtime compensation, failure to provide compliant meal
11 periods, failure to authorize and permit compliant rest periods, failure to pay minimum wages, failure
12 to timely pay final wages, failure to provide accurate wage statements, and failure to maintain accurate
13 time and payroll records.

14 2. Plaintiff’s First through Seventh Causes of Action are brought as a class action on behalf
15 of himself and similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter collectively
16 referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” as defined more fully in paragraph 17, below) pursuant
17 to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by
18 Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according
19 to proof at trial.

20 3. Plaintiff’s Eighth Cause of Action is brought as a representative action on behalf of
21 himself and other current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California
22 at any time within the period beginning one (1) year and sixty-five (65) days prior to the filing of the
23 original complaint in this action and ending at the time this action settles or proceeds to final judgment
24 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”) pursuant to California Labor Code
25 sections 2698, *et seq.* Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee against whom one or more of the alleged
26 violations occurred. The civil penalties sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the
27 Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

28 4. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,

1 Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except
2 those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify
3 any other basis for jurisdiction.

4 5. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
5 Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise
6 intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over
7 them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

8 6. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain
9 offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

10 **PARTIES**

11 7. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of California. At all times relevant to this action,
12 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California as an hourly,
13 non-exempt employee.

14 8. Defendant DVD FACTORY, INC., is and at all times herein mentioned was, a
15 corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and registered to do
16 business in the state of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes that DVD FACTORY, INC. is a
17 manufacturing company specializing in compact disc (“CD”) and digital versatile disc (“DVD”)
18 replication.

19 9. Plaintiff is ignorant of the identities of defendants Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and
20 therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. The Doe defendants may be individuals,
21 partnerships, or corporations. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that, at all times
22 mentioned herein, each of the Doe defendants was the parent, subsidiary, agent, servant, employee, co-
23 venturer, and/or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and was at all times mentioned acting
24 within the scope, purpose, consent, knowledge, ratification and authorization of such agency,
25 employment, joint venture and conspiracy. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege their true
26 names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each
27 of the fictitiously named Doe defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein
28 alleged, and that Plaintiff’s damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by its conduct.

1 10. Defendants DVD FACTORY, INC.; and DOES 1 thorough 50 are collectively referred
2 to herein as “Defendants.”

3 11. Defendants are and at all times herein mentioned were, (a) conducting business in the
4 County of Los Angeles, State of California, and (b) the employer of Plaintiff consistent with the
5 California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“Wage Orders”).

6 12. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the
7 working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff, the Class, and
8 the Aggrieved Employees so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers jointly
9 liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

10 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times relevant to this
11 action, Defendants were the alter egos, predecessors, divisions, affiliates, integrated enterprises, joint
12 employers, subsidiaries, parents, principals, related entities, co-conspirators, authorized agents,
13 partners, joint venturers, and/or guarantors, actual or ostensible, of each other. Each defendant was
14 dominated by his, her, or its codefendants, and each was the alter ego of the other.

15 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in perpetrating the acts
16 and omissions alleged herein, Defendants, and each of them, acted pursuant to, and in furtherance of,
17 their policies and practices of not paying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
18 earned and due, through methods and schemes which include, but are not limited to: failing to pay
19 overtime; failing to provide meal periods and rest breaks; failing to properly maintain records; failing
20 to provide accurate itemized statements for each pay period; failing to timely pay final wages; failing
21 to pay timely wages during employment; and requiring, permitting, or suffering the employees to work
22 off the clock, in violation of the California Labor Code (“Labor Code”) and applicable Industrial
23 Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order(s).

24 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in accordance with
25 Labor Code Section 558.1, Defendants and any person acting on behalf of Defendants are liable for
26 violating, or causing to violate, any provision regulating minimum wages or hours and days of work in
27 any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, or Labor Code Sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1193.6, 1194,
28 or 2802.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

16. Plaintiff brings the First through Seventh Causes of Action as a class action on his own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

17. The proposed class is defined as follows: All current and former non-exempt employees of any of the Defendants within the State of California at any time commencing four (4) years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's original complaint up until the time that notice of the certified class action is provided to the class (hereinafter referred to as the "Class" or "Class Members").

18. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish other subclasses as appropriate.

19. The Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all Class Members is impracticable. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be thirty (30) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other Class Members demonstrated herein. Plaintiff and the Class members worked as hourly, non-exempt employees for Defendants in California, including in various construction related positions at Defendants' work-site locations. Plaintiff and the other similarly situated Class Members were employed by Defendants and shared similar job duties and responsibilities, were subjected to the same policies and practices, and endured similar violations at the hands of Defendants.

c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member, with whom he has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other Class Members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred,

1 and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees,
2 that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action
3 for the substantial benefit of each Class Member.

4 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
5 efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all Class Members
6 is impractical.

7 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance
8 public policy objectives. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of
9 fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the Class Members
10 who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their
11 rights.

12 20. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class that predominate over
13 questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact, among
14 others, exist as to the members of the Class:

15 a. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other Class
16 Members for all hours worked;

17 b. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work more than
18 eight (8) hours per day and/or more than forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the
19 legally required overtime compensation at the regular rate of pay to Plaintiff and the
20 other Class Members;

21 c. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other Class Members of meal and/or rest
22 periods or required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work during meal and/or
23 rest periods without compensation;

24 d. Whether Defendants failed to pay meal period premium wages to Class Members when
25 they were not provided legally compliant meal periods;

26 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay rest period premium wages to Class Members when
27 they were not authorized and permitted to take legally compliant rest periods;

28 f. Whether Defendants had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and

the other Class Members for all hours worked, and for missed, short, late or interrupted meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;

g. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class Members within the time required upon their discharge or resignation from employment;

h. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement, or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code was willful;

i. Whether Defendants complied with wage statement reporting as required by the California Labor Code, including Section 226;

j. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq.* based on their improper withholding of compensation and deduction of wages;

k. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and

l. Whether Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

21. Plaintiff is a former full-time, hourly-paid employee of Defendants. Prior to his separation in or about September 2022, Plaintiff worked in Defendant's factory located at 28623 Industry Drive in Valencia, California.

22. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees.

23. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees; and to directly or indirectly control work rules, working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

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

25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants engaged in an

1 ongoing and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees. As
2 set forth in more detail below, this scheme involved, *inter alia*, regularly requiring Plaintiff, the Class,
3 and the Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock without compensation, thereby failing to pay them
4 for all hours worked, including minimum and overtime wages. Defendants also implemented policies
5 that prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from accurately recording the actual
6 time worked, resulting in a failure to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
7 owed. In addition, Defendants routinely failed to permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
8 Employees to take timely and duty-free meal periods and rest periods in violation of California law,
9 and failed to pay associated meal and rest period premium wages. Defendants also failed to provide
10 accurate itemized wage statements for each pay period, and failed to timely pay all wages owed during
11 and upon termination of employment.

12 26. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented policies
13 and practices which failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with timely
14 and duty-free meal periods. Defendants routinely failed to relieve Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
15 Employees of all duties during their meal periods, regularly failed to relinquish control over Plaintiff,
16 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees during their meal periods, regularly failed to permit Plaintiff,
17 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees a reasonable opportunity to take their meal periods, and
18 regularly impeded or discouraged Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from taking thirty
19 (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks no later than the end of their fifth hour of work and/or from
20 taking a second thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal break no later than their tenth hour of work for
21 shifts lasting more than ten (10) hours. Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of meal
22 periods taken by Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

23 27. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants did not adequately inform
24 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take meal periods under California
25 law. Moreover, Defendants systematically disregarded their own written policies regarding the
26 provision and timing of meal periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Instead,
27 Defendants' actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
28 Employees in a way that prohibited them from taking timely and duty-free meal periods, and to require

1 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work through their meal periods, for which they
2 were not compensated.

3 28. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the
4 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for meal periods that were missed, late,
5 interrupted, or shortened in violation of California law. Defendants knew or should have known that
6 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment
7 of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, short, late,
8 and/or interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants routinely failed to provide legally
9 compliant meal periods to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, and routinely failed to
10 pay one additional hour of pay to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rate
11 of pay when a meal period was missed, short, late, and/or interrupted.

12 29. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented policies
13 and practices which prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from taking timely
14 and duty-free rest periods. Defendants regularly failed to provide, authorize, and permit Plaintiff, the
15 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take full, uninterrupted, off-duty rest periods for every shift
16 lasting three and one-half (3.5) to six (6) hours and/or two full, uninterrupted, off-duty rest periods for
17 every shift lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours, and failed to make a good faith effort to authorize, permit,
18 and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each work period.

19 30. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants did not adequately inform
20 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take rest periods under California
21 law. Moreover, Defendants systematically disregarded their own written policies regarding the
22 provision and timing of rest periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Instead,
23 Defendants' actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
24 Employees in a way that regularly prohibited them from taking timely and duty-free rest periods, and
25 to regularly require Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work through their rest
26 periods.

27 31. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the
28 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for rest periods that were missed, late, interrupted,

1 or shortened in violation of California law. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the
2 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one
3 additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, short, late, and/or
4 interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants routinely failed to authorize and permit
5 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take duty-free rest periods, and failed to pay one
6 additional hour of pay to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rate of pay
7 when a rest period was missed, short, late and/or interrupted.

8 32. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly required
9 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work off the clock. Plaintiff, the Class,
10 and the Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to perform uncompensated work off the clock
11 for which they were not compensated.

12 33. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants implemented policies that
13 prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from accurately recording the actual time
14 worked, resulting in a failure to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed.
15 In addition, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants employed a rounding policy that was not
16 neutral and designed to consistently round time in Defendants' favor, ensuring that Plaintiff and the
17 Class were not paid for all time worked.

18 34. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
19 Employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week.

20 35. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to pay all
21 overtime compensation owed to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees when they worked
22 in excess of eight (8) hours in a single work day and/or forty (40) hours in a single work week, or in
23 excess of twelve (12) hours in a single work day and/or eighty (80) hours in a single work week.
24 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were
25 entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving wages for
26 overtime compensation.

27 36. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay overtime to
28 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates

1 of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

2 37. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to pay
3 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at least minimum wages for all hours worked.
4 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were
5 entitled to receive at least minimum wages for all hours worked and that they were not receiving at
6 least minimum wages for all hours worked. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages included, *inter*
7 *alia*, failing to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at the required minimum wage
8 pursuant to California law, requiring Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform
9 work off the clock, and failing to accurate record all time worked by Plaintiff, the Class, and the
10 Aggrieved Employees which resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages to Plaintiff, the Class,
11 and the Aggrieved Employees.

12 38. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to pay
13 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or
14 resignation. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
15 Employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them upon termination within the time
16 permissible under California Labor Code section 202. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
17 Employees did not receive payment of all final wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation,
18 including overtime compensation and minimum wages within any time permissible under California
19 Labor Code section 202.

20 39. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to pay
21 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages within any time permissible under
22 California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code Section 204. Defendants knew or should
23 have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all wages
24 owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees did not
25 receive payment of all wages, including overtime compensation, minimum wages, and meal and rest
26 period premiums.

27 40. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to provide
28 complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendants

1 knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to
2 receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, they did
3 not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter*
4 *alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked, the actual gross wages earned, and the
5 correct rates of pay.

6 41. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to keep
7 complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendants
8 knew or should have known that Defendants were required to keep complete and accurate time payroll
9 records for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with California law, but,
10 in fact, did not keep complete and accurate time and payroll records.

11 42. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
12 maintain accurate records relating to Plaintiff's, the Class's, and the Aggrieved Employees' work
13 periods, meal periods, total daily hours, hours per pay period, and applicable pay rates.

14 43. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants knew or should have
15 known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant
16 to California law. Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully,
17 knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff, the Class, and the
18 Aggrieved Employees that they paid all wages owed to them, all in order to increase Defendants'
19 profits.

20 44. California Labor Code Section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code
21 shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly ... for any wages or penalty due to him [or
22 her] under this article."

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**

25 **(Against All Defendants)**

26 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every
27 allegation set forth above.

28 46. California Labor Code Section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission

1 (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a
2 rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the
3 number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

4 47. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were
5 required to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members employed by Defendants, and working more than
6 eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half
7 for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

8 48. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were required
9 to pay Plaintiff and the Class overtime compensation at a rate of two times their regular rate of pay for
10 all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8)
11 hours on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

12 49. California Labor Code Section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-
13 and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty
14 (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and no overtime
15 compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day
16 or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

17 50. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members regularly worked
18 in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

19 51. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay
20 overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other Class Members.

21 52. Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the unpaid balance of
22 overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor
23 Code Sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

24 53. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other Class Members
25 are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys’ fees.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every
5 allegation set forth above.

6 55. At all relevant times, the relevant IWC Order and California Labor Code Sections 226.7
7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

8 56. At all relevant times, California Labor Code Section 226.7 provides that no employer
9 shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of
10 the California IWC.

11 57. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
12 Section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a
13 work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of
14 not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more
15 than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and
16 employee.

17 58. At all relevant times, California Labor Code Section 512(a) further provides that an
18 employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten
19 (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less
20 than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the
21 second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the
22 first meal period was not waived.

23 59. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were
24 scheduled to work for a period of time longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally-
25 mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours
26 without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

27 60. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were
28 scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of ten (10) hours were required to work for periods

1 longer than ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30)
2 minutes.

3 61. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff
4 and the other Class Members to miss their meal periods and to take meal periods that were late,
5 shortened, or interrupted, and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other Class Members the full meal
6 period premium for missed, shortened, late, or interrupted meal periods.

7 62. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class
8 Members the full meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226.7.

9 63. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor
10 Code Sections 226.7 and 512(a).

11 64. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code Section
12 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional
13 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal period was
14 not provided.

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)**

17 **(Against All Defendants)**

18 65. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every
19 allegation set forth above.

20 66. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
21 Section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

22 67. At all relevant times, California Labor Code Section 226.7 provides that no employer
23 shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the
24 California IWC.

25 68. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer
26 shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in
27 the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked
28 daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof unless the

1 total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3.5) hours.”

2 69. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and other Class Members
3 to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each
4 four (4) hour period worked.

5 70. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the other
6 Class Members to work during rest periods, failed to allow Plaintiff and the other Class Member to
7 take any rest period and/or failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the other Class Members to take
8 uninterrupted, duty-free rest breaks.

9 71. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class
10 Members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226.7 for work
11 performed during rest periods, and/or for failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other Class
12 Members from taking uninterrupted rest periods.

13 72. Defendants’ conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code
14 section 226.7.

15 73. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section
16 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional
17 hour of pay at the employees’ regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period
18 was not provided.

19 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)**

21 **(Against All Defendants)**

22 74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every
23 allegation set forth above.

24 75. At all relevant times, California Labor Code Sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide
25 that the minimum wage to be paid to employees and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum
26 so fixed is unlawful.

27 76. On information and belief based on the above described unlawful labor practices, during
28 the relevant time period, Defendants regularly failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiff and the other

1 Class Members as required pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

2 77. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the minimum wage as
3 required violates California Labor Code Sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections,
4 Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage
5 compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal
6 to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

7 78. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other Class
8 Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid
9 and interest thereon.

10 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203)**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 79. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every
14 allegation set forth above.

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

21 81. During the relevant time period, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Class
22 Members with Defendants ended, *i.e.* was terminated by quitting or discharge. Defendants intentionally
23 and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and other Class Members who are no longer employed by
24 Defendants all of their wages, earned and unpaid, including but not limited to minimum wages, straight
25 time wages, overtime wages, and vested but unused vacation time, within seventy-two (72) hours of
26 their leaving Defendants' employ.

27 82. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and other Class Members who are no longer
28 employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving

1 Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201 and 202.

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

6 84. Plaintiff and other Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants are
7 entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to
8 a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code Section 203.

9 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))**

11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 85. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every
13 allegation set forth above.

14 86. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code Section 226(a) provides
15 that every employer shall furnish each of its employees an accurate itemized statement in writing
16 showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate
17 units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all
18 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated
19 and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the
20 employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and
21 address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the
22 pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The
23 deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly
24 dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall
25 be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location
26 within the State of California.

27 87. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with
28 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, but are not limited to the failure list

1 the total number of hours worked, the actual gross wages earned, and the correct rates of pay.

2 88. Because of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code Section 226(a), Plaintiff and
3 the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

4 89. More specifically, Plaintiff and the Class have been injured by Defendants' intentional
5 and willful violation of California Labor Code Section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal
6 right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and itemized wage statements
7 pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a).

8 90. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual
9 damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code Section 226(a), or an
10 aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

11 91. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance with
12 this section, pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(g).

13 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)**

15 **(Against All Defendants)**

16 92. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every
17 allegation set forth above.

18 93. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful
19 and harmful to Plaintiff and the Class, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly,
20 Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of
21 Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

22 94. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and constitute
23 unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code Section
24 17200, *et seq.*

25 95. Plaintiff is a "person" within the meaning of Business & Professions Code Section
26 17204, has suffered injury, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive relief,
27 restitution, and other appropriate equitable relief.

28 96. A violation of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq.* may be

1 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies and
2 practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the Class, to work overtime without proper
3 compensation violate California Labor Code Sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants'
4 systematic policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the Class, to work
5 without legally compliant meal periods and rest breaks violate California Labor Code Sections 226.7
6 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and
7 the Class violate California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. On information and belief,
8 Defendants also violated California Labor Code Sections 204, 226(a), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 510, and
9 1174(d).

10 97. Wage-and-hour laws express fundamental public policies. Paying employees their
11 wages and overtime, providing them with meal periods and rest breaks, etc., are fundamental public
12 policies of California. Labor Code Section 90.5(a) sets forth the public policies of this State vigorously
13 to enforce minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to work
14 under unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding employers and their employees from competitors
15 who lower costs to themselves by failing to comply with fair labor standards. Through the conduct
16 alleged in this Complaint Defendants have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated specific
17 provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business practices in
18 violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

19 98. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants unlawfully
20 gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

21 99. Plaintiff and the Class have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business
22 acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or
23 property.

24 100. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff
25 and the Class are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a
26 period that commences four years prior to the filing of this Complaint; an award of attorneys' fees
27 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award
28 of costs.

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 2699, et seq.)**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and every
5 allegation set forth above.

6 102. Plaintiff brings his Eighth Cause of Action as a representative action on behalf of
7 himself and all other aggrieved employees (“Aggrieved Employees”) in the capacity as a private
8 attorney general pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section
9 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”).

10 103. PAGA specifically provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties for
11 violations of the Labor Code as follows: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision
12 of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce
13 Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or
14 employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action
15 brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
16 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.” Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a).

17 104. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the Labor Code violations alleged above were
18 committed against him during his time of employment. Plaintiff is therefore, an “aggrieved employee”
19 under PAGA.

20 105. As set forth in detail above, during all times relevant to this Action, Defendants have
21 routinely subjected Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to violations of California Labor Codes by:

- 22 a. Failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned minimum wage
23 compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 *et seq.*
24 b. Failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation
25 in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198 *et seq.*
26 c. Failing to provide legally compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
27 Employees, and failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees an additional hour
28 of premium pay for meal period violations in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

- d. Failing to provide authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take duty-free rest periods, and failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees an additional hour of premium pay for rest period violations in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.
- e. Failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages at the end of their employment in violation of Labor Code § 203.
- f. Failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed during employment in violation of Labor Code § 204.
- g. Failing to furnish Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226.
- h. Failing to maintain accurate records relating to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours, hours per pay period, total wages and compensation, and applicable pay rates in violation of Labor Code § 1174(d) and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

106. California Labor Code sections 2699 and 2699.5, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of himself and the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California, requests and is entitled to recover penalties against Defendants for the Labor Code violations described above, including but not limited to penalties under the applicable Wage Order(s), penalties under California Labor Code sections 2699, 558, 210, 1197.1, 226, 226.3 and 1174.5, and 1197.1, and any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

1. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3. On December 7, 2022, Plaintiff, through his counsel of record, by online filing with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by certified mail to the Defendants, notified Defendants and the LWDA of the specific provisions of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders that Defendants have violated, including the facts and theories to support the violations, and of Plaintiff's intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under PAGA. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee required under Labor Code § 2699.3. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3, no notice has been received and/or will have

1 been received by Plaintiff from the LWDA evidencing its intention to investigate within sixty-five (65)
2 days from the postmark of Plaintiff's PAGA Notice. Thus, Plaintiff has or will soon have complied
3 with all of the requirements set forth in Labor Code Section 2699.3 to commence and proceed with a
4 representative civil action under the PAGA.

5 107. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect
6 his interests and the Aggrieved Employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by
7 Defendants. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor
8 Code § 2699(g)(1), and any other applicable statute.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all other members of the general public
11 similarly situated, and as a private attorney general, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants,
12 jointly and severally, as follows:

13 **Class Certification**

- 14 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
15 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
16 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
17 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current/last
18 known contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

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

20 5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
21 Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime
22 wages due to Plaintiff and other Class Members;

23 6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages
24 as may be appropriate;

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

27 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
28 Labor Code section 1194; and

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the Class;

11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the Class of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226.7;

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

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

16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Third Cause of Action

17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiff and the Class;

18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the Class of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226.7;

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

and

22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code Sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the Class;

24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code Section 1197.1 for Plaintiff and the Class in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

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

27. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);

28. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Section 1194.2; and

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and other Class Members no longer employed by Defendants;

31. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

32. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for Plaintiff and other Class Members who have left Defendants' employ;

33. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code Section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the Class, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

36. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

37. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(e); and

38. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

39. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business

1 and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiff and the Class all overtime
2 compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the Class, failing
3 to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the Class, failing to pay Plaintiff's and other Class
4 Members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202 and 204 and by
5 violating California Labor Code Sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800, and 2802;

6 40. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and the Class and all pre-judgment interest
7 from the day such amounts were due and payable;

8 41. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds
9 disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result
10 of violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*;

11 42. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
12 Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5;

13 43. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
14 Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

15 44. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

16 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

17 45. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 2699(g)(1) of California Labor Code;

18 46. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, 210,
19 558, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and all other penalties allowed by the California Labor Code and/or
20 other applicable statutes; and

21 47. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

22 DATED: February 7, 2023

23 **PROXY LAW FIRM LLP**

24
25 

26 _____
27 Hengameh S. Safaei
28 Attorneys for Plaintiff JULIO CESAR
MARTINEZ RODRIGUEZ, individually
and on behalf of others similarly situated

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

DATED: February 7, 2023

PROXY LAW FIRM LLP

Rafael

Hengameh S. Safaei
Attorneys for Plaintiff JULIO CESAR
MARTINEZ RODRIGUEZ, individually
and on behalf of others similarly situated

PROOF OF SERVICE

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. My business address is 10880 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1101 Los Angeles, California 90024.

On February 7, 2023, I served the following document(s): PLAINTIFF'S INITIAL STATUS CONFERENCE CLASS ACTION RESPONSE STATEMENT on the following person or persons:

Defendant DVD FACTORY, INC.

Marilou Gomez
Agent for Service of Process for DVD Factory, Inc.
28623 Industry Drive
Valencia, CA 91355
Attn: Admin Office

The documents were served by the following means:

☐ **BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION.** Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I electronically served the document(s) to the person(s) at the electronic service address(es) listed above.

☐ **BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY.** I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the addresses listed above. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

☐ **BY FAX TRANSMISSION.** Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax number(s) listed above. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used.

☐ **BY MESSENGER SERVICE.** I served the documents by placing them in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in the attached Proof of Service List and providing them to a professional messenger service for service.

☒ **BY UNITED STATES MAIL.** I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the address(es) identified above in this Proof of Service and

☐ deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepared.

☒ placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

I am a resident of and employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Los Angeles, California.

1 ☐ **BY PERSONAL SERVICE.** I personally delivered the documents to the persons at the
2 addresses listed in the attached Proof of Service List. (1) For a party represented by an attorney,
3 delivery was made (a) to the attorney personally; or (b) by leaving the documents at the attorney's
4 office, in an envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served, with a
5 receptionist or an individual in charge of the office; or (c) if there was no person in the office with
6 whom the notice or papers could be left, by leaving them in a conspicuous place in the office between
the hours of nine in the morning and five in the evening. (2) For a party, delivery was made to the
party or by leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not younger than 18
years of age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that to the best of
my knowledge that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on February 7, 2023, at Los Angeles, California.



Hengameh S. Safaei