

1 DANIEL F. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 251488
daniel@gaineslawfirm.com
2 ALEX P. KATOFISKY, ESQ. SBN 202754
alex@gaineslawfirm.com
3 EVAN S. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 287668
evan@gaineslawfirm.com
4 **GAINES & GAINES, APLC**
4550 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Suite 100
5 Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: (818) 703-8985
6 Facsimile: (818) 703-8984

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

APR 06 2023

BY *Abrianna Rodriguez*
ABRIANNA RODRIGUEZ, DEPUTY

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Stephanie Becerra, on behalf of herself and all "aggrieved employees"
pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

8
9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO**

11 STEPHANIE BECERRA, on behalf of herself
12 and all "aggrieved employees" pursuant to
Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 CITRUS VILLAGE GC, INC., a California
16 corporation, and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

17 Defendants.
18

CASE NO: **CIV SB 2308118**

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR PENALTIES
PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699(f)
FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE
§§ 201, 202, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, AND
1194 AND PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE
§ 2699(a) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR
CODE §§ 226.3 AND 558**



1 Plaintiff STEPHANIE BECERRA (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and others as an
2 “aggrieved employee” under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified as
3 Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, complains of CITRUS VILLAGE GC, INC., a California corporation,
4 and/or any subsidiaries or affiliated companies (hereinafter referred to as “Defendants”), as follows:

5 **I.**

6 **INTRODUCTION AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

7 1. This is a Representative Action, pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, on behalf of
8 Plaintiff and other non-exempt California employees who currently work or formerly worked for
9 Defendants (“Aggrieved Employees”).

10 2. For at least one (1) year prior to the filing of this action and at least one (1) year prior
11 to the date Plaintiff began the process of exhausting the administrative requirements, pursuant to
12 Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, and continuing to the present (the “liability period”), Defendants have had
13 consistent policies of:

14 a. Failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees all overtime wages due
15 during the course of employment, in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 558, and 1194. Defendants paid
16 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees straight time wages only, with no adjustment for premium
17 overtime wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees would work in excess of 8
18 hours per day, but were never properly compensated for work performed in excess of eight (8) hours
19 in a workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the
20 regular rate of pay. This violates Labor Code §§ 510, 558, and 1194;

21 b. Failing to pay premium wages to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who were
22 denied off-duty rest periods, in violation of Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 2-2001.
23 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were routinely unable to take a 10-minute rest period for every
24 four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, but were not paid premium wages of one hour’s pay
25 for each missed rest period. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were simply denied and not
26 authorized to take their legally entitled rest periods. Rest periods were not free of employee control
27 and Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were never paid premium wages for missed rest periods. This
28 violates Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 2-2001;

1 c. Failing to pay premium wages to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who were
2 denied proper meal periods, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Wage Order
3 2-2001. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were routinely denied, and not authorized to take, a
4 timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded five hours, or a
5 second timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded ten hours,
6 but were not paid premium wages of one hour's pay for each missed first or second meal period.
7 When Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were able to take a meal period, they were often late or cut
8 short. This violates Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558 and IWC Wage Order 2-2001;

9 d. Failing to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with wage statements
10 that fully and accurately itemized the requirements set forth in Labor Code § 226(a). Plaintiff and
11 Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due, as stated above. As such, the wage statements
12 provided by Defendants failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code
13 §§ 226(a)(1) and 226.3, total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(2) and 226.3, net
14 wages earned, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(5) and 226.3, and all applicable hourly rates in
15 effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in
16 violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a)(9) and 226.3; and

17 e. Failing to timely pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees all wages due at the
18 separation of their employment based on the time frames required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As
19 stated above, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due during the course of
20 their employment and, as a result of this failure, they were not timely paid all wages due at the
21 separation of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-202 and is alleged on behalf of
22 Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees no longer employed by Defendants.

23 3. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all Aggrieved Employees pursuant to Labor Code §
24 2698 *et seq.*, seeks civil penalties for Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code.

25 4. Venue is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395.
26 The Labor Code violations alleged against Defendants herein arose San Bernardino County,
27 California.

28 ///

1 II.

2 PARTIES

3 A. Plaintiff

4 5. Plaintiff STEPHANIE BECERRA was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt
5 employee from approximately October 2021 through September 2022 in San Bernardino County,
6 California.

7 B. Defendant

8 6. Defendant CITRUS VILLAGE GC, INC. is a California corporation that employed
9 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees in San Bernardino County, California.

10 7. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
11 of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who
12 therefore sues Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is
13 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a
14 DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will
15 seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants
16 designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

17 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted
18 in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendant, carried out a joint scheme,
19 business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant is legally
20 attributable to the other Defendants.

21 9. The Defendants named herein as DOE 1 through DOE 10 are and were persons acting
22 on behalf of, or acting jointly with, Defendants, who violated, or caused to be violated, one or more
23 provisions of the California Labor Code as alleged herein.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

III.

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**PLAINTIFF AND ALL AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699(f) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR
CODE §§ 201, 202, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, AND 1194 AND PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE
§ 2699(a) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE §§ 226.3 AND 558**

10. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 9 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

11. As a result of the acts alleged above, including the Labor Code violations set forth in paragraph 2 above, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*

12. For each such violation, Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to penalties and other relief in an amount to be shown at the time of trial subject to the following formula:

a. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f), \$100 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, and 1194; and

b. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f), the penalties as authorized by Labor Code §§ 226.3 and 558.

13. Civil penalties recovered will be allocated 75% to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and 25% to the affected employees.

14. On January 26, 2023, Plaintiff sent a letter, by online submission to the LWDA and by certified mail, return receipt requested, to Defendants setting forth the facts and theories of the violations alleged against Defendants, as prescribed by Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A), no notice was received by Plaintiff from the LWDA within sixty-five (65) calendar days of January 26, 2023. Plaintiff may therefore commence this action to seek civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees she seeks to represent request relief as described below.

1 IV.

2 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

3 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 4 1. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* for Plaintiff and all other
5 Aggrieved Employees;
- 6 2. An award providing for payment of costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1)
7 and other applicable law;
- 8 3. An award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1) and other applicable
9 law; and
- 10 4. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

11 Dated: April 5, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

12 GAINES & GAINES
13 A Professional Law Corporation

14 By: Daniel F. Gaines
15 DANIEL F. GAINES
16 EVAN S. GAINES
17 Attorneys for Plaintiff
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28