

KENNETH H. YOON (State Bar No. 198443)
STEPHANIE E. YASUDA (State Bar No. 265480)

Clerk of the Superior Court
By C. Drakes ,Deputy Clerk

YOON LAW, APC
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 102
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (213) 612-0988
Facsimile: (213) 947-1211

Attorneys for Plaintiff Raymita Anderson

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

RAYMITA ANDERSON, as an individual and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

VALLEY FARM MARKETS, INC., a
California corporation;
VALLEY FARM MARKET LA JOLLA,
INC., a California corporation;
VALLEY FARM MARKET DEL MAR INC.,
a California corporation;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25CU053736C

CLASS ACTION

**CLASS ACTION AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
PENALTIES FOR:**

- (1) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 226.7 AND 512;**
- (2) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 1194 and 510;**
- (3) VIOLATION OF WAGE ORDER 7-
2001, § 5;**
- (4) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
SECTION 226;**
- (5) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 201-204;**
- (6) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
SECTION 2698 *et seq.*;**
- (7) BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS
CODE SECTION 17200 *et seq.***

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Raymita Anderson (“Plaintiff”) hereby submits her Class Action and
2 Representative Action Complaint for Damages and Penalties against Defendants Valley Farm
3 Markets, Inc., Valley Farm Market La Jolla, Inc., and Valley Farm Market Del Mar Inc. and
4 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), on behalf of herself and the Class of
5 other similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants for meal period and rest
6 break wages, minimum and overtime wages, reporting time pay, and penalties as follows:

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. This class action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 to 204, 226, 226.7,
9 510, 512, 1194, 2698 *et seq.* (the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”)), Industrial
10 Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 7-2001 (codified as California Code of Regulations
11 Title 8 § 11070), and Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* (Unfair Competition Law
12 (“UCL”)).

13 2. This Complaint challenges Defendants’ systemic illegal employment practices
14 resulting in violations of the stated provisions of the Labor Code and Business and Professions
15 Code against the identified class of employees.

16 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges Defendants joint and
17 severally acted intentionally and with deliberate indifference and conscious disregard to the
18 rights of all employees in (1) failing to provide meal periods and rest breaks; (2) failing to pay
19 all minimum and overtime wages; (3) failing to provide accurate wage statements; (4) failing to
20 pay reporting time pay; and (5) failing to pay all wages due and owing upon termination of
21 employment.

22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

23 4. This class action is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.
24 The monetary damages sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the
25 Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The damages sought by
26 Plaintiff individually are less than \$75,000.00.

27 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution,
28 Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except

those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

6. This Court has jurisdiction over the violations of Labor Code §§ 201 to 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, PAGA, IWC Wage Order 7-2001, and the UCL.

7. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, each party has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of California law so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

8. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, the named Defendants transact business and/or have offices in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county.

PARTIES

9. Plaintiff is an individual residing in the State of California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within the statutory time period.

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are each corporations licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California, including the County of San Diego.

11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff prays for leave to amend this complaint when the true names and capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of Defendants designated as a DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and members of the general public and the Class to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

12. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within

the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and that all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and consent of each Defendant designated herein.

As such and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to Labor Code §§ 201 to 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, PAGA, IWC Wage Order 7-2001, and the UCL.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

13. Definition: Plaintiff seeks class certification pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 of a class of all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked in California during the period from October 6, 2021, to the present, including the following Subclasses:

(a) Meal Period Subclass: all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked one or more shifts in excess of six (6) hours in California during the period from October 6, 2021, to the present;

As an alternative to Subclass (a): all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked one or more shifts in excess of six (6) hours in California without receiving a 30-minute break during which they were relieved of all duties, during the period from October 6, 2021, to the present;

(b) Rest Break Subclass: all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked one or more shifts of three and one-half (3.5) hours or more in California during the period from October 6, 2021, to the present;

As an alternative to Subclass (b): all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked one or more shifts of three and one-half (3.5) hours or more in California without receiving all required paid 10-minute breaks during which they were relieved of all duties, during the period

October 6, 2021, to the present;

(c) **Overtime Subclass:** all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked one or more shifts in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek in California during the period from October 6, 2021, to the present;

As an alternative to Subclass (c): all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked one or more shifts in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek in California and were not properly paid all overtime wages during the period from October 6, 2021, to the present;

(d) **Minimum Wage Subclass** all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked in California and were not properly paid all minimum wages during the period from October 6, 2021, to the present;

(e) **Reporting Time Subclass:** all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked in California, and who reported to work but had their scheduled work shift canceled and/or reduced to less than half of the scheduled shift, at any time during the period of October 6, 2021, to the present;

(f) **Wage Statement Subclass:** all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked in California and received an itemized wage statement during the period of October 6, 2022, to the present;

(g) **Terminated Employee Subclass:** all hourly-paid, non-exempt employees of Defendants who worked in California and who were not properly paid all wages on termination or within 72 hours thereof during the period of October 6, 2022, to the present;

14. Numerosity: The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The identities of the members of the Class are readily ascertainable by objective, easily understood terms contained within the Class and

Subclass definitions, and by review of Defendants' records, including payroll records.

15. Adequacy of Representation: Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the Class defined above. Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the Class and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have prosecuted and settled wage-and-hour class actions in the past and currently have a number of wage-and-hour class actions pending in California courts.

16. Defendants administered a corporate policy, practice and/or procedure of (1) failing to pay all overtime and minimum wages; (2) failing to provide meal periods and rest breaks; (3) failing to pay reporting time pay; (4) failing to provide accurate wage statements; (5) failing to timely pay all wages due and owing upon termination of employment; and (6) engaging in unfair business practices. Plaintiff alleges this corporate conduct is accomplished with the advance knowledge and designed intent to willfully withhold appropriate wages for work performed members of the Class.

17. Common Question of Law and Fact: There are predominant common questions of law and fact and a community of interest amongst Plaintiff and the claims of the Class concerning whether Defendants' policies and practices regularly denied Class Members overtime and minimum wages, meal periods and rest breaks, reporting time pay, accurate wage statements, and wages upon termination of employment.

18. Typicality: The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of all members of the Class. Plaintiff is a member of the Class and have suffered the alleged violations of Labor Code §§ 201 to 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, IWC Wage Order 7-2001, and the UCL. Plaintiff worked at least one shift in excess of six hours during which she was not provided all duty-free, legally mandated meal periods. Plaintiff worked at least one shift of 3.5 hours or greater during which she was not authorized and permitted all duty-free, legally mandated rest breaks. Plaintiff reported for work for at least one shift that was canceled, and was not paid reporting time pay for half the scheduled shift. Plaintiff worked at least one shift over eight hours during which she was not paid for all hours worked, including overtime hours worked. Plaintiff received wage statements during her employment. Plaintiff's employment terminated during the statutory

1 period and Plaintiff was not timely paid all wages due and owing her upon termination.

2 **19.** The Labor Code upon which Plaintiff bases her claims is broadly remedial in
3 nature. These laws and labor standards serve an important public interest in establishing
4 minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws and labor standards protect
5 the average working employee from exploitation by employers who may seek to take advantage
6 of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of
7 employment.

8 **20.** The nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members
9 of the Class identified herein make the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate
10 procedure to redress the wrongs alleged herein. If each employee were required to file an
11 individual lawsuit, the corporate Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable
12 advantage since it would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each
13 individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Requiring each Class
14 Member to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by
15 employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current
16 employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damage to their careers at
17 subsequent employment.

18 **21.** The prosecution of separate actions by the individual Class Members, even if
19 possible, would create a substantial risk of (a) inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect
20 to individual Class Members against the Defendants and which would establish potentially
21 incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendants, and/or (b) adjudications with respect to
22 individual Class Members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of
23 the other Class Members not parties to the adjudications or which would substantially impair or
24 impede the ability of the Class Members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the
25 individual members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual
26 prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses.

27 **22.** Such a pattern, practice and administration of corporate policy regarding illegal
28 employee compensation described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by

1 Plaintiff and the Class identified herein, in a civil action, for the unpaid balance of the full amount
2 of minimum and overtime wages, meal period and rest break premiums, reporting time pay, and
3 penalties, including interest thereon, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as consequential
4 damages.

5 **23.** Proof of a common business practice or factual pattern, which Plaintiff
6 experienced and is representative of, will establish the right of each Class Member to recovery
7 on the causes of action alleged herein.

8 **24.** The Class is commonly entitled to a specific fund with respect to the
9 compensation illegally and unfairly retained by Defendants. This action is brought for the benefit
10 of the entirety of all Class and will result in the creation of a common fund.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE SECTIONS 226.7 AND 512**

13 **REGARDING MEAL PERIOD AND REST BREAK WAGES**

14 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF THE CLASS AND**
15 **SUBCLASSES (a), (b), (f), and (g))**

16 **25.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 24 as
17 though fully set forth herein.

18 **26.** At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses (a), (b), (f),
19 and (g) had the right to take a 10-minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major
20 fraction thereof, and a 30-minute meal period for every five (5) hours worked.

21 **27.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants regularly did not provide employees with
22 all their meal periods and rest breaks and did not provide proper compensation for this failure.

23 **28.** Defendants' policy of failing to provide Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses
24 (a), (b), (f), and (g) with all legally-mandated meal periods and rest breaks is a violation of
25 California law.

26 **29.** Defendants willfully failed to pay employees whom they did provide the
27 opportunity to take meal periods and rest breaks the premium compensation set out in Labor
28 Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order, and Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses

1 (a), (b), (f), and (g) are owed wages for meal period and rest break premiums as set forth above.

2 **30.** Such a pattern, practice and administration of corporate policy as described herein
3 is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses (a),
4 (b), (f), and (g) identified herein, in a civil action, for the balance of the unpaid premium
5 compensation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order, including
6 interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

7 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE SECTIONS 510 AND 1194**

9 **REGARDING OVERTIME AND MINIMUM WAGES**

10 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF THE CLASS AND**
11 **SUBCLASSES (c), (d), (f), and (g))**

12 **31.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 30 as
13 though fully set forth herein.

14 **32.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their non-
15 exempt employees' minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all hours
16 worked over eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek.

17 **33.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants regularly failed to compensate its
18 employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay all minimum wages and, where
19 applicable, overtime wages.

20 **34.** This resulted in Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses (c), (d), (f), and (g)
21 receiving total wages in an amount less than minimum wage and, when applicable, deprived
22 Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses (c), (d), (f), and (g) of overtime wages.

23 **35.** Such a pattern, practice and administration of corporate policy regarding illegal
24 employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery
25 by Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses (c), (d), (f), and (g) in a civil action, for the unpaid
26 balance of the full amount of minimum wages owing, including liquidated damages, interest,
27 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to the mandate of California Labor Code § 1194.

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **REGARDING REPORTING TIME PAY**

3 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF THE**

4 **CLASS AND SUBCLASSES (e), (f), and (g))**

5 **36.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 35 as
6 though fully set for herein.

7 **37.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were obligated to pay reporting time pay
8 to Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses (e), (f), and (g), in an amount equivalent to half the
9 scheduled day's work on any day during which the employees reported to work but either had
10 their work shift cancelled or reduced to less than half the scheduled shift.

11 **38.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class and
12 Subclasses (e), (f), and (g) for reporting time pay. Plaintiff asserts that on days she and the Class
13 and Subclasses (e), (f), and (g) reported to work only to have their shifts cancelled or reduced to
14 less than half, Defendants compensated them less than the required reporting time pay.

15 **39.** Such a pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy as
16 described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by the Plaintiff and the Class
17 and Subclasses (e) and (g) in a civil action, for all damages and/or penalties pursuant to IWC
18 Wage Order No. 7, including interest thereon, penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of
19 suit.

20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **REGARDING RECORD KEEPING**

22 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF**

23 **THE CLASS AND ALL SUBCLASSES)**

24 **40.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 39 as
25 though fully set forth herein.

26 **41.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to maintain accurate
27 records pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code § 226.

28 **42.** In violation of Labor Code § 226, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation

1 to keep *accurate* records for their California employees. For example, as a result of Defendants'
2 various Labor Code violations, Defendants failed to keep accurate records of Plaintiff and the
3 Class and all Subclasses' gross wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned, and all
4 applicable hourly rates and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Plaintiff received at
5 least one such wage statement during her employment with Defendants.

6 **43.** Such a pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy as
7 described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by the Plaintiff and the Class
8 and all Subclasses identified herein, in a civil action, for all damages and/or penalties pursuant
9 to Labor Code § 226, including interest thereon, penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs
10 of suit.

11 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE SECTIONS 201 to 204**

13 **REGARDING WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

14 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF**
15 **THE CLASS AND ALL SUBCLASSES)**

16 **44.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 43 as
17 though fully set for herein.

18 **45.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees all
19 wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to California Labor Code §§
20 201 to 204.

21 **46.** As a result of Defendants' alleged Labor Code violations alleged above,
22 Defendants regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class and all Subclasses their final wages
23 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to
24 Labor Code § 203.

25 **47.** The conduct of Defendants and their agents and employees as described herein
26 was willfully done in violation of Plaintiff and the Class and all Subclasses' rights, and done by
27 managerial employees of Defendants.

28 **48.** Defendants' willful failure to provide Plaintiff and the Class and all Subclasses

1 the wages due and owing them upon separation from employment results in a continuation of
2 wages up to thirty (30) days from the time the wages were due. Therefore, Plaintiff and Class
3 Members who have separated from employment are entitled to compensation pursuant to Labor
4 Code § 203.

5 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FOR VIOLATION OF PAGA**

7 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF ALL AGGRIEVED**
8 **EMPLOYEES)**

9 **49.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 48 as
10 though fully set forth herein.

11 **50.** PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code
12 which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its
13 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the
14 California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved
15 employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

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

21 **52.** On July 31, 2025, Plaintiff provided written notice to the LWDA and Defendants
22 of the specific provisions of the Labor Code she contends were violated, and the theories
23 supporting her contentions. To date, she has not received a response.

24 **53.** Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees are "aggrieved employees" as
25 defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of
26 Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

27 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

28 **54.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to authorize and permit a

1 10-minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, and provide a
2 30-minute meal period for every five (5) hours worked, pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code
3 §§ 226.7, 512, and 558.

4 **55.** During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to relieve employees of duty
5 for meal periods and rest breaks.

6 **Failure to Pay Overtime and Minimum Wages**

7 **56.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their non-
8 exempt, hourly-paid employees minimum wages for all hours worked, and overtime wages as
9 applicable, pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

10 **57.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other
11 similarly-situated current and former employees for all hours worked, including unpaid
12 onboarding time and other off-the-clock time. This resulted in a failure to compensate Plaintiff
13 and other aggrieved employees all minimum wages due and owing for off-the-clock work, and
14 overtime wages, as applicable.

15 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

16 **58.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees
17 within the time limits specified under Labor Code §§ 203.1 and 204.

18 **59.** During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other
19 aggrieved employees all wages due to them within the time period specified by Labor Code §
20 204, including as outlined above and by failing to timely issue paychecks.

21 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During and Upon Termination of Employment**

22 **60.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees in
23 a timely fashion pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§ 201 to 204.

24 **61.** As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants
25 failed to pay Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees all wages due them within the time
26 periods specified by Labor Code §§ 201-204 during and upon termination of employment.

27 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

28 **62.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep *accurate* records

1 regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174(d),
2 and to produce records upon request within the time required by Labor Code § 226(c).

3 **63.** As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants failed to
4 keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff and other similarly-situated current and former
5 employees. For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate
6 records regarding Plaintiff and other similarly-situated current and former employees' gross
7 wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates and the
8 number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

9 **Failure to Pay Reporting Time Pay**

10 **64.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required pay employees at least half
11 the scheduled shift, for a minimum of two hours and maximum of four hours, on any day during
12 which employees reported for work but were not put to work or were put to work for less than
13 half the scheduled shift, pursuant to the mandate of IWC Wage Order 7-2001 § 5.

14 **65.** During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and other aggrieved
15 employees to report for short periods of work without being paid for at least half the scheduled
16 shift or two hours of pay, whichever was greater. This resulted in a failure to pay reporting time
17 pay as required.

18 **Penalties**

19 **66.** Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of other
20 current and former aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants,
21 and each of them, unpaid wages, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant, as
22 well as all statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, including but not limited to:

23 **67.** Penalties under California Labor Code § 2699 in the amount of up to two hundred
24 dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period.

25 **68.** Penalties under California Labor Code § 210 in the amount of a hundred dollars
26 (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred
27 dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation, plus
28 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld;

1 **69.** Penalties in the amount of \$25 per employee per pay period for inaccurate wage
2 statements, \$250 per employee for missing wage statements, and \$750 for failure to produce
3 records upon request;

4 **70.** Penalties under Labor Code § 558 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each
5 aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for
6 each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

7 **71.** Penalties under Labor Code § 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100)
8 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred fifty dollars
9 (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

10 **72.** Penalties in an amount sufficient to recover unreimbursed business expenses
11 pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(d);

12 **73.** Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or
13 other statutes; and

14 **74.** Attorneys' fees and costs as permitted by law.

15 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FOR VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 *et seq.***

17 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF ON BEHALF OF**

18 **THE CLASS AND ALL SUBCLASSES)**

19 **75.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 76 as
20 though fully set for herein.

21 **76.** Defendants, and each of them, have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and
22 unlawful business practices in California by practicing, employing and utilizing the employment
23 practices outlined above, inclusive, to wit, by knowingly denying employees: (1) all overtime
24 and minimum wages, (2) all meal period and rest break wages, (3) reporting time pay, (4)
25 accurate wage statements, and (5) all wages due and owing upon termination of employment.

26 **77.** Defendants' utilization of such business practices constitutes unfair, unlawful
27 competition and provides an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors.

28 **78.** The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years preceding the

filing of the complaint in this action.

79. Defendants have engaged in unlawful, deceptive and unfair business practices, as proscribed by California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, including those set forth above, thereby depriving Plaintiff and the Class and Subclasses the minimum working condition standards and conditions due to them under the California laws and IWC Wage Orders as specifically described therein.

80. Plaintiff seeks, on her own behalf, and on behalf of other members of the Class and Subclasses who are similarly situated, full restitution of monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by the Defendants by means of the unfair practices complained of herein.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for herself and all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For an order certifying the proposed Class;
2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as the representative of the Class as described herein;
3. For an order appointing counsel for Plaintiff as counsel for the Class;
4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for all meal period and rest break wages owed, and for costs;
5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for all minimum wages owed, and for costs and attorney's fees;
6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for reporting time pay, and for costs and attorneys' fees;
7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for damages or penalties pursuant to statute as set forth in California Labor Code § 226, and for costs and attorneys' fees;
8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for all minimum wages owed, for waiting time wages according to proof pursuant to California Labor Code §203;
9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for civil penalties and wages pursuant to statute

as set forth in Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, for Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 216, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 510, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197.1, and Wage Order 7-2001 § 5;

10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and other similarly affected members of the general public of all funds unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; and

11. On all causes of action for attorneys' fees, interest, and costs as provided by California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, 226, 1194, PAGA, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for such other and further relief the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: October 6, 2025

YOON LAW, APC




Kenneth H. Yoon
Attorneys for Plaintiff Raymita Anderson

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, for herself and the Class and Subclasses, hereby demands a jury trial as provided by California law.

Dated: October 6, 2025

YOON LAW, APC



Kenneth H. Yoon
Attorneys for Plaintiff Raymita Anderson