

ZACK I. DOMB, SBN 265185
zack@dombrauchwerger.com
DEVIN E. RAUCHWERGER, SBN 274234
devin@dombrauchwerger.com
DOMB & RAUCHWERGER LLP
1055 E. Colorado Blvd, Fifth Floor
Pasadena, California 91106
Telephone: (213) 537-9225

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

03/28/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: K. Martinez Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff
IRON GULLA

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

IRON GULLA, individually and on behalf
of others similarly situated, and on behalf of
other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LA PUGLIA LLC; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23STCV01627

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

- (1) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR
CODE §§ 510 AND 1198 (UNPAID
OVERTIME)
- (2) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR
CODE §§ 226.7 AND 512(A)
(UNPAID MEAL PERIOD
PREMIUMS)
- (3) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR
CODE § 226.7 (UNPAID REST
PERIOD PREMIUMS)
- (4) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR
CODE §§ 1194, 1197 AND 1197.1
(UNPAID MINIMUM WAGES)
- (5) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR
CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203 (FINAL
WAGES NOT TIMELY PAID)
- (6) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§
204 AND 210 (WAGES NOT
TIMELY PAID DURING
EMPLOYMENT)
- (7) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR
CODE § 226(A) (FAILURE TO
PROVIDE ACCURATE WAGE
STATEMENTS)
- (8) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR
CODE §§ 2800 AND 2802 (FAILURE
TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY
BUSINESS EXPENSES)

- 1 (9) VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§
2 226 AND 246(I) (FAILURE TO
3 PROVIDE WRITTEN NOTICE OF
4 PAID SICK LEAVE AND
5 SUPPLEMENTAL PAID SICK
6 LEAVE)
7 (10) VIOLATION OF CAL. BUSINESS
8 & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200,
9 ET SEQ.
10 (11) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR
11 CODE § 2699, (PRIVATE
12 ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT)

13 Plaintiff Iron Gulla (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of other members of the
14 general public similarly situated, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
15 Private Attorneys General Act, based upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are likely
16 to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery,
17 alleges as follows:

18 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

19 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants La Puglia LLC and DOES 1 through
20 50 (hereinafter also collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code
21 violations, unfair business practices, and civil penalties stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay
22 overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest
23 periods, failure to pay minimum wage, failure to timely pay wages, failure to provide written
24 notice of paid sick leave and supplemental paid sick leave, failure to provide accurate wage
25 statements, failure to maintain accurate time and payroll records, and failure to reimburse
26 necessary business-related expenses.

27 2. Plaintiff’s First through Tenth Causes of Action are brought as a class action on
28 behalf of himself and similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter
collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” as defined more fully in paragraph 13
below) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and
restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and
will be established according to proof at trial.

//

3. Plaintiff's Eleventh Cause of Action is brought as a representative action on behalf of himself and other hourly, non-exempt employees of Defendants against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Aggrieved Employees") pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee against whom one or more of the alleged violations occurred. The civil penalties sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

4. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other 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.

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

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

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff Iron Gulla is an individual residing in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

8. Defendant La Puglia LLC is and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, and registered to do business in the state of California.

9. Plaintiff is ignorant of the identities of defendants Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. The Doe defendants may be individuals, partnerships, or corporations. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges,

1 that, at all times mentioned herein, each of the Doe defendants was the parent, subsidiary, agent,
2 servant, employee, co-venturer, and/or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and was at
3 all times mentioned acting within the scope, purpose, consent, knowledge, ratification and
4 authorization of such agency, employment, joint venture and conspiracy. Plaintiff will amend this
5 Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and
6 believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Doe defendants is responsible in
7 some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that Plaintiff's damages as herein alleged
8 were proximately caused by its conduct. La Puglia LLC and Doe Defendants 1 through 50 are
9 collectively referred to herein as "Defendants."

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

13 11. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants, directly or indirectly controlled or
14 affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of
15 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees so as to make each of said Defendants
16 employers and employers jointly liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

17 **EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES**

18 12. On January 25, 2023, Plaintiff exhausted his administrative remedies by timely
19 providing written notice by online submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to
20 Defendant LA PUGLIA LLC of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to
21 have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff has
22 not received an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of Plaintiff's notice.

23 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

27 14. The proposed class is defined as follows: All current and former non-exempt
28 employees of any of the Defendants within the State of California at any time commencing four

(4) years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's 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").

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

16. 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 over fifty (50) 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 will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other Class Members with whom he has a well-defined community of interest.

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

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

e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to

1 assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class
2 actions provide the Class Members who are not named in the complaint
3 anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

4 17. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class that predominate over
5 questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact,
6 among others, exist as to the members of the Class:

- 7 a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement, or reduction, in
8 accordance with the California Labor Code was willful;
- 9 b. Whether Defendants had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff
10 and the other Class Members for all hours worked, and missed, short, late or
11 interrupted meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- 12 c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work more
13 than eight (8) hours per day and/or more than forty (40) hours per week and failed
14 to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other Class
15 Members;
- 16 d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other Class Members of meal
17 and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work
18 during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- 19 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay meal period premium wages to Class Members
20 when they were not provided with a legally compliant meal period;
- 21 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay rest period premium wages to Class Members
22 when they were not authorized and permitted to take legally compliant rest
23 periods;
- 24 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other Class
25 Members for all hours worked;
- 26 h. Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the
27 required minimum wage pursuant to California law;
- 28 i. Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members proper

overtime compensation pursuant to California law;

j. 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;

k. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all business related expenses and costs in violation of California Labor Code section 2802;

l. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other Class Members during their employment;

m. Whether Defendants failed to provide written notice of paid sick leave and supplemental paid sick leave as required by the California Labor Code;

n. Whether Defendants failed to provide paid sick leave and supplemental paid sick leave as required by the California Labor Code;

o. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code, including section 226;

p. Whether Defendants' conduct was with malice, fraud or oppression;

q. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;

r. 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;

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

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

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

18. Defendants operate a Southern Italian Food Restaurant in Los Angeles County and offer catering and private party services.

//

1 19. Defendants employed Plaintiff to work as a server from approximately February
2 15, 2021 to approximately November 15, 2022.

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

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

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

11 23. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented
12 policies and practices which failed to provide Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
13 with timely and duty-free meal periods. Defendants routinely failed to relieve Plaintiff, the Class,
14 and the Aggrieved Employees of all duties during their meal periods, regularly failed to relinquish
15 control over Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees during their meal periods,
16 regularly failed to permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees a reasonable
17 opportunity to take their meal periods, and regularly impeded or discouraged Plaintiff, the Class,
18 and the Aggrieved Employees from taking thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks no later
19 than the end of their fifth hour of work and/or from taking a second thirty (30) minute
20 uninterrupted meal break no later than their tenth hour of work for shifts lasting more than ten
21 (10) hours. ***Defendants also failed to provide premium pay for meal periods that were not***
22 ***compliant with California law and failed to maintain accurate records of meal periods taken***
23 ***by Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.***

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

1 and the Aggrieved Employees in a way that prohibited them from taking timely and duty-free
2 meal periods, and to require Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work through
3 their meal periods, for which they were not compensated.

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

14 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants engaged in
15 an ongoing and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt
16 employees. As set forth in more detail below, this scheme involved, *inter alia*, regularly requiring
17 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock without compensation,
18 thereby failing to pay them for all hours worked, including minimum and overtime wages.
19 Defendants also implemented policies that prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
20 Employees from accurately recording the actual time worked, resulting in a failure to pay
21 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed. In addition, Defendants
22 routinely failed to permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and
23 duty-free meal periods and rest periods in violation of California law. Defendants also failed to
24 reimburse Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related
25 expenses. Defendants also failed to provide supplemental paid sick leave as required by California
26 law, and failed to provide proper notice of said leave.

27 27. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented
28 policies and practices which prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from

1 taking timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants regularly failed to provide, authorize, and
2 permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take full, uninterrupted, off-duty rest
3 periods for every shift lasting three and one-half (3.5) to six (6) hours and/or two full,
4 uninterrupted, off-duty rest periods for every shift lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours, and failed to
5 make a good faith effort to authorize, permit, and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each
6 work period.

7 28. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants did not adequately
8 inform Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take rest periods under
9 California law. Moreover, Defendants systematically disregarded their own written policies
10 regarding the provision and timing of rest periods for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
11 Employees. Instead, Defendants' actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiff, the Class,
12 and the Aggrieved Employees in a way that regularly prohibited them from taking timely and
13 duty free rest periods, and to regularly require Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
14 to work through their rest periods.

15 29. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay
16 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for rest periods that were
17 missed, late, interrupted, or shortened in violation of California law. Defendants knew or should
18 have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all
19 rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period
20 was missed, short, late, and/or interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants routinely
21 failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take duty-free
22 rest periods, and failed to pay one additional hour of pay to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
23 Employees at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, short, late and/or
24 interrupted.

25 30. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly required
26 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work off the clock. Although
27 Defendants prohibited overtime, Defendants still regularly required that Plaintiff, the Class, and
28 the Aggrieved Employees complete all of their assigned duties. To do so, Plaintiff, the Class, and

1 the Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to perform work off the clock for which they
2 were not compensated.

3 31. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants implemented
4 policies that prohibited Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from accurately
5 recording the actual time worked, resulting in a failure to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the
6 Aggrieved Employees all wages owed.

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

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

17 34. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay
18 overtime to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked
19 based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

20 35. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
21 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at least minimum wages for all hours
22 worked. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
23 Employees were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for all hours worked and that they
24 were not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked. Defendants' failure to pay
25 minimum wages included, *inter alia*, failing to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
26 Employees at the required minimum wage pursuant to California law, requiring Plaintiff, the
27 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work off the clock, and implementing time
28 rounding policies that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages to Plaintiff, the Class,

1 and the Aggrieved Employees.

2 36. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
3 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or
4 resignation. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
5 Employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them upon termination within the time
6 permissible under California Labor Code section 202. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
7 Employees did not receive payment of all final wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation,
8 including overtime compensation and minimum wages within any time permissible under
9 California Labor Code section 202.

10 37. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
11 pay Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages within any time permissible
12 under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204. Defendants knew
13 or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to
14 receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
15 Employees did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime compensation, minimum
16 wages, and meal and rest period premiums.

17 38. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
18 provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
19 Employees. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved
20 Employees were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with
21 California law, but, in fact, they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from
22 Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours
23 worked, the actual gross wages earned, the correct rates of pay, all applicable hourly rates, and
24 the name and address of the legal entity of the employer.

25 39. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
26 keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.
27 Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants were required to keep complete and
28 accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with

California law, but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

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

41. Throughout the timer period involved in this case, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business related expenses, including but not limited to work-related tools. Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants were required to reimburse Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business related expenses and costs, but, in fact, failed to do so in violation of California law.

42. California Labor Code section 246(I) states that an "employer shall provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement as described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages." Defendants' knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely, accurate, itemized wage statements to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance with Labor Code sections 226(a) and 246(i), and to keep accurate records as required by § 1174(d). The wage statements provided to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not accurately reflected the amounts of available paid sick leave, supplemental paid sick leave, vacation, or paid time off. Such failures caused injury to Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, by, among other things, depriving them of the rights afforded them by the 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave law, and by impeding them from knowing the accurate amounts of available paid sick leave, vacation, or paid time off.

43. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant to California law. Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff, the

1 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees that they paid all wages owed to them, all in order to increase
2 Defendants' profits.

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

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

8 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

11 46. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare
12 Commission ("IWC") Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without
13 compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular
14 rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

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

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

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

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

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

5 52. During the relevant time period, Defendants implemented time rounding practices
6 that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages to Plaintiff and the other Class Members,
7 including minimum and overtime wages.

8 53. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members the unpaid
9 balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of
10 California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

11 54. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other Class
12 Members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and
13 attorneys' fees.

14 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

16 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

19 56. At all relevant times, the relevant IWC Order and California Labor Code sections
20 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff and the other Class Members' employment by
21 Defendants.

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

25 58. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
26 section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work
27 for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal
28 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the

employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

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

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

61. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of ten (10) hours were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

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

63. During the relevant time period, Defendants rounded employee meal periods in order to avoid having to provide employees with meal periods for a complete thirty-minutes and to intentionally and willfully avoid paying employees meal period premiums that were cut short.

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

65. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

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

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)

(Against All Defendants)

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

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

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

70. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3.5) hours."

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

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

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

74. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

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

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against All Defendants)

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

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

78. During the relevant time period, Defendants regularly failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiff and the other Class Members as required pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

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

80. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully

unpaid and interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against All Defendants)

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

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

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

84. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and other Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

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

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

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 204 and 210)**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

6 88. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
7 wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any
8 calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable
9 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

10 89. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
11 wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of
12 any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and
13 payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

14 90. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
15 wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday
16 for the next regular payroll period.

17 91. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to
18 pay Plaintiff and other Class Members all wages due to them, within any time period permissible
19 under California Labor Code section 204.

20 92. Plaintiff and other Class Members are entitled to recover all available remedies for
21 Defendants' violations of California Labor Code section 204, including statutory penalties
22 pursuant to Labor Code section 210(b).

23 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

25 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

28 //

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

14 95. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the
15 Class with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, but are not limited
16 to the failure list the total number of hours worked, the actual gross wages earned, the correct
17 rates of pay, all applicable hourly rates, and the name and address of the legal entity of the
18 employer.

19 96. Because of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a),
20 Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

21 97. More specifically, Plaintiff and the Class have been injured by Defendants'
22 intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were
23 denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and
24 itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

25 98. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their
26 actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code section
27 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

28 //

1 99. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance
2 with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

3 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)**

5 **(Against All Defendants)**

6 100. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein each and
7 every allegation set forth above.

8 101. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must
9 reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
10 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her job
11 duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

12 102. Plaintiff and the Class incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that
13 were not fully reimbursed by Defendants. Defendants' failure to reimburse for all necessary
14 business-related expenses and costs included their failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for
15 costs incurred as a result of, including but not limited to, simple negligence.

16 103. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the
17 Class for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to
18 recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and
19 scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred
20 the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226 and 246(i) (Failure to Provide Written Notice of Paid**

23 **Sick Leave and Supplemental Paid Sick Leave)**

24 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

27 105. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 246(i) stated
28 that an "employer shall provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid

sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement as described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages.”

106. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely, accurate, itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and the Class in accordance with Labor Code sections 226(a) and 246(i), and to keep accurate records as required by § 1174(d). The wage statements provided to Plaintiff and the Class, and the records maintained by the Defendants, have not accurately reflected the amounts of available paid sick leave, vacation, or paid time off. Such failures caused injury to Plaintiff and the Class, by, among other things, depriving them of the rights afforded them by the 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave law, and by impeding them from knowing the accurate amounts of available paid sick leave, vacation, or paid time off.

107. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, but are not limited to failure to provide paystubs, and/or the failure list the total number of hours worked, the actual gross wages earned, the correct rates of pay, and the address of the legal entity of the employer.

108. Because of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

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

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

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

//

//

1 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

6 113. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
7 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff and the Class, to the general public, and Defendants'
8 competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest
9 within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

10 114. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
11 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
12 Code section 17200, *et seq.*

13 115. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* may
14 be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies
15 and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the Class, to work overtime without
16 paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.
17 Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and
18 the Class, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation
19 violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policies and
20 practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the Class violate California Labor Code
21 sections 201, 202, 203 and 204.

22 116. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 221, 226(a), 1194, 1197,
23 1197.1, 510, 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

24 117. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants
25 unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

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

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

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 2699, Et Seq.)

(Against All Defendants)

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

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

122. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

123. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them. As set forth in detail above, during all times relevant to this Action, Defendants have routinely subjected Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to violations of California Labor Codes by:

Failure to Pay Overtime

124. Defendants' failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair

activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

125. Defendants' failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

126. Defendants' failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

127. Defendants' failure to pay legally required minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

128. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

129. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 204.

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

130. Defendants' failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226(a).

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

131. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California Labor Code section

1 1174(d) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section
2 1174(d).

3 **Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs**

4 132. Defendants' failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees for
5 necessary business-related expenses and costs in accordance with California Labor Code sections
6 2800 and 2802 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code
7 sections 2800 and 2802.

8 133. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on
9 behalf of all aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants and each
10 of them, business expenses, unpaid wages, and/or untimely wages according to proof, interest,
11 attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, as well as all statutory
12 penalties against Defendants, and each of them, including but not limited to:

- 13 a. Penalties under California Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a hundred
14 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation,
15 and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
16 each subsequent violation;
- 17 b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11010, et seq. in
18 the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
19 the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation;
20 and
- 21 c. Penalties under California Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely
22 independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor
23 Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per
24 pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
25 aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation; and
- 26 d. Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California Labor
27 Code and/or other statutes.

28 //

134. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five percent (25%) to the aggrieved employees.

135. Further, Plaintiff is entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5 and 2699 and any other applicable statute.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

Class Certification

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

As to the First Cause of Action

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

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

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

//

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California 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 California Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiff and the Class;

36. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 210; and

37. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

38. 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;

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

40. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e); and

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

42. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

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

44. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

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

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

47. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code sections 226(a) and 246(i), and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the Class, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage

statements thereto;

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

49. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 226(e) and 246;
and

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

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

51. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiff and the Class all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the Class, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the Class, failing to pay Plaintiff's and other Class Members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202 and 204 and by violating California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800, and 2802;

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

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

54. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

55. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

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

As to the Eleventh Cause of Action


57. For civil penalties and wages pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f) and (g) and 558 plus costs and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and

1 2802; and

2 58. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

3
4 Dated: March 28, 2023

DOMB & RAUCHWERGER LLP

5
6
7 By: 


Zack I. Domb
Devin E. Rauchwerger
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Iron Gulla

1 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

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

3
4 Dated: March 28, 2023

DOMB & RAUCHWERGER LLP

5
6 By: 

7 Zack I. Domb
8 Devin E. Rauchwerger
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 Iron Gulla

**PROOF OF SERVICE
(CCP § 1013(a) and 2015.5)**

I, the undersigned, am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; am employed with Domb & Rauchwerger LLP and my business address is 1055 East Colorado Blvd., Fifth Floor, Pasadena, California 91106. My e-mail address is jessica@dombrauchwerger.com.

On March 28, 2023, I served the foregoing document entitled **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT** on all the appearing and/or interested parties in this action by placing ☐ *the original* ☒ *a true copy* thereof enclosed in sealed envelope(s) addressed as follows:

Alden J. Parker, Esq.
William Okamoto, Esq.
Fisher & Phillips LLP
621 Capitol Mall, Ste 1400
Sacramento, CA 95814
aparker@fisherphillips.com
wokamoto@fisherphillips.com
vrathke@fisherphillips.com
dherrera@fisherphillips.com

Attorneys for Defendant, La Puglia, LLC

☒ **[by MAIL]** - I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postage cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing this affidavit.

☒ **[by ELECTRONIC SERVICE]** - Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification address listed above.

☐ **[by PERSONAL SERVICE]** - I caused to be delivered by messenger such envelope(s) by hand to the office of the addressee(s). Such messenger is over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action and employed with Express Network, whose business address is 1605 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 800, Los Angeles, CA 90015.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed March 28, 2023, at Rio Linda, California.

Jessica Delgado

Print Name

By:



Signature