

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:

Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:

1004

January 17, 2023

CA2805

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc.
Certified Mail #70222410000060826396
John Kelleher
1380 Lead Hill Blvd., Suite 206
Roseville, CA 95661

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of January 17, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Paul Kooman (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California as a non-exempt employee from October of 2019 to September of 2022 and entitled to the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment for all time worked under Defendant’s control. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks (and paying for meal and rest break premiums at the correct regular rate), and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise

Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) *et seq.* Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provides to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees fails to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements fails to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements are added up, they do not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statue of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

**2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:
Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:
1004

January 17, 2023
CA2805

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC
Certified Mail #70222410000060826402
CT Corporation System
AMANDA GARCIA
330 N. BRAND BLVD. Suite 700,
GLENDALE, CA 91203

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of January 17, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Paul Kooman (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California as a non-exempt employee from October of 2019 to September of 2022 and entitled to the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment for all time worked under Defendant’s control. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks (and paying for meal and rest break premiums at the correct regular rate), and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for

work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) *et seq.* Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provides to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees fails to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements fails to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements are added up, they do not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:
Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:
1004

January 17, 2023
CA2805

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

S&D Carwash Management, LLC
Certified Mail #70222410000060826419
AMANDA GARCIA
330 N. BRAND BLVD. Suite 700,
GLENDALE, CA 91203

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of January 17, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Paul Kooman (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California as a non-exempt employee from October of 2019 to September of 2022 and entitled to the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment for all time worked under Defendant’s control. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks (and paying for meal and rest break premiums at the correct regular rate), and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise

Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) *et seq.* Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provides to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees fails to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements fails to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements are added up, they do not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statue of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

2 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

3 Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

2255 Calle Clara

4 La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

5 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff

7 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

8 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

9 PAUL KOOMAN, an individual, on behalf of
10 himself and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

11
12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 S&D CARWASH MANAGEMENT LLC, a
15 Limited Liability Company; QUICK QUACK
CAR WASH, INC., a Corporation; QUICK
16 QUACK CARWASH MANAGEMENT, LLC,
a Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1
17 through 50, inclusive,

18
19 Defendants.

Case No. _____

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
2. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
3. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 510;
4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
8. FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203; and,
9. FAILURE TO PAY SICK PAY WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB CODE §§201-204, 233, 246

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Paul Kooman (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and all other
2 similarly situated current and former employees alleges on information and belief, except for
3 her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following.

4
5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. S&D Carwash Management, LLC is a limited liability company that at all relevant
7 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the state of
8 California.

9 2. Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned
10 herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the state of California.

11 3. Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC is a limited liability company that at
12 all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in
13 the state of California.

14 4. PLAINTIFF alleges there has existed a unity of interest between S&D Carwash
15 Management, LLC, Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc., and Quick Quack Carwash Management,
16 LLC as evidenced by pay stubs, California Secretary of State registered business information,
17 and the companies PLAINTIFF worked for, such that any individuality and separateness
18 between the entities has ceased and both defendants are referred to herein as (“DEFENDANT”).

19 5. DEFENDANT owns and operates car washes in California.

20 6. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from October of 2019
21 to September of 2022 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt
22 employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and
23 payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

24 7. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
25 defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by S&D Carwash Management,
26 LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC in
27 California, including any employees staffed with S&D Carwash Management, LLC and/or
28 Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash Management, LLC by a third party,

1 and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the
2 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as
3 determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy
4 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
5 (\$5,000,000.00).

6
7 8. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their
9 losses incurred during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT's
10 policy and practice which failed to lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT's
11 policy and practice alleged herein was an unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice
12 whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain wages due PLAINTIFF and the
13 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the
15 future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
16 CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful
17 conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

18 9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
19 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
20 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious
21 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this
22 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when
23 they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information
24 and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through
25 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings
26 that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

27 10. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them
28 acting on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its

1 authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally
2 participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the
3 conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to
4 the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and
5 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result
6 of the conduct of the Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

7 8 **THE CONDUCT**

9 11. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT
10 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time
11 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
12 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.
13 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without
14 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,
15 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to
16 be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by
17 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal
18 break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers
19 a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the
21 course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid less
22 than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than
23 "rounded" time. Additionally, DEFENDANT engages in the practice of requiring
24 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work off the clocking that
25 DEFENDANT, as a condition of employment, required these employees to submit to
26 mandatory temperature checks and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior
27 to clocking into DEFENDANT's timekeeping system for the workday. As a result,
28 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeit minimum wage, overtime

1 wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly
2 recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and
3 practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time
4 worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

5 12. State and federal law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal
6 and rest break premiums at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF
7 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive
8 pay that is tied to specific elements of an employee's performance.

9 13. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
10 Members' compensation is DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
11 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
12 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
13 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
14 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular
15 rate of pay in order to pay overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and
16 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive
17 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating
18 overtime pay and meal and rest break premium pay. Management and supervisors described
19 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
20 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure
22 to do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and rest break
23 premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

24 14. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute
26 off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF
27 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform
28 work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without

1 receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide
2 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for
3 some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10)
4 hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period
5 times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.
6 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks
7 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy
8 and practice.

9 15. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required from time to time to work in excess of
11 four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees
12 were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at
13 least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten
14 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to
15 time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts
16 worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
17 CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally,
18 the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-
19 duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an
20 employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so
21 doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and
22 permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all
23 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control
24 over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose
25 controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes
26 back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS Members from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule
28

1 which states PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members cannot leave the work
2 premises during their rest period.

3 16. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to
4 accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the
5 actual amount of time these employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare
6 Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked, meaning the time during which an
8 employee was subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee was
9 permitted or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT required these employees to work
10 off the clock without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control.
11 As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
12 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all time worked. As a
13 result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited time worked by
14 working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the
15 applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off
16 the clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT fails to pay
17 minimum wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194,
18 1197, and 1197.1.

19 17. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
20 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements
21 which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab.
22 Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an
23 accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages
24 earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
25 amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all
27 applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable
28 pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section

1 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members failed to identify such information. More specifically, the
3 wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When
4 the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total
5 hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2).
6 DEFENDANT also violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(8) by failing to correctly list the
7 legal entity that employed PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR -SUB-CLASS
8 Members. Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to
9 issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under
10 California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided
11 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements
12 which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

13 18. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be
14 deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
15 the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll
16 period. Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

17 in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided
18 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in
19 Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial
20 violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee; (2) For
each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars
(\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount
unlawfully withheld.

21 19. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and members of
22 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members within seven (7) days of the close of the
23 payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to for
24 the “Hourly” regular wage payments.

25 20. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in
27 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt
28 employees earn non-discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate

1 of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members at their base rates of pay.

3 21. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(1)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
4 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime
5 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90
6 days of employment.

7 22. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay
8 at the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members routinely
9 earned non-discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay.
10 However, when sick pay was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and
11 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of
12 pay, as required under Cal. Lab. Code Section 246.

13 23. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF
14 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS their correct wages and accordingly owe
15 waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is
16 informed and believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular
17 rate was willful, such that PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose
18 employment has separated are entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code
19 Sections 201-203.

20 24. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer
21 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer
22 to said employee." DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFF and
23 other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, made unlawful deductions from
24 compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members,
25 failed to disclose all aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF
26 and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and thereby failed to pay these
27 employees all wages due at each applicable pay period and upon termination. PLAINTIFF
28

1 and members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS seek recovery of all illegal
2 deductions from wages according to proof, related penalties, interest, attorney fees and costs.

3 25. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
4 PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses
5 incurred by the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct
6 consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California
7 Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses
8 incurred in the course and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly
9 states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures
10 or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
11 duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful,
12 unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

13 26. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own
15 personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
16 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost
17 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit.
18 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by
19 DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their
20 employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to,
22 costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of
23 DEFENDANT.

24 27. Specifically as to PLAINTIFF, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
25 required off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFF as required by the applicable Wage
26 Order and Labor Code and failed to pay PLAINTIFF all minimum and overtime wages due
27 to PLAINTIFF. DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which provided timely off-
28 duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and also failed to compensate PLAINTIFF for

1 PLAINTIFF's missed meal and rest breaks. The nature of the work performed by the
2 PLAINTIFF did not prevent PLAINTIFF from being relieved of all of PLAINTIFF's duties
3 for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to
4 provide PLAINTIFF with the legally required meal periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's
5 business records. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed
6 the sum or value of \$75,000.

7 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8 28. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of
9 Civil Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section
10 17203. This action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly
11 situated employees of DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

12 29. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
13 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
14 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and
15 facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii)
16 committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

18 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

19 30. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and
20 Deceptive Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the
21 "UCL") as a Class Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a
22 California class, defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by S&D
23 Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack
24 Carwash Management, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with S&D
25 Carwash Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack
26 Carwash Management, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (the
27
28

1 “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the
2 filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the
3 “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

5 31. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
7 accordingly.

8 32. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
9 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage
10 Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally,
11 knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to record all
12 meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members,
13 even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform
14 this work and permits or suffers to permit this work.

15 33. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately for all meal and rest breaks missed as
17 required by California laws. The DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of policy and
18 procedure failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails
19 to have in place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 Member is paid as required by law. This common business practice is applicable to each
21 and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a class-wide basis as
22 unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*
23 (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this claim.

24 34. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS Members is impracticable.

26 35. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under
27 California law by:
28

- 1 (a) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of , Cal. Bus. &
2 Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL"), by unlawfully, unfairly
3 and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and
4 procedures that failed to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other
5 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked, including
6 minimum wages owed and overtime wages owed for work performed
7 by these employees; and,
8 (b) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by
9 failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

11 36. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a
12 Class Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 13 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous
14 that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition
15 of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
16 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief
17 issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS will apply to every member of the
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS;
20 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims
21 of each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all
22 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, was classified as a
23 non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the
24 DEFENDANT's deceptive practice and policy which failed to provide
25 the legally required meal and rest periods to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 and thereby underpaid compensation to PLAINTIFF and
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a
28 result of DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the

1 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or
2 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive and unfair
3 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,

- 4 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and
5 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained
6 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation.
7 There are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative
8 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would
9 make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 Members.

12 37. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action
13 is properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 14 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
15 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution
16 of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA
17 CLASS will create the risk of:

- 18 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish
20 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
22 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be
24 dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the
25 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
26 protect their interests.

- 27 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused
28 to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS,

1 making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT failed to pay all wages due to
3 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;

4 1) With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on
5 behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate
6 exclusively to restitution because through this claim
7 PLAINTIFF seeks declaratory relief holding that the
8 DEFENDANT's policy and practices constitute unfair
9 competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and
10 incidental equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and
11 remedy the conduct declared to constitute unfair competition;

12 (c) Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of
14 California law as listed above, and predominate over any question
15 affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class
16 Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
17 adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

18 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
19 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate
20 actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will
21 be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic
22 losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members when compared to the substantial expense and burden
24 of individual prosecution of this litigation;

25 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
26 litigation that would create the risk of:

27 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
28 individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which

1 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
2 DEFENDANT; and/or,

3 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be
5 dispositive of the interests of the other members not
6 parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or
7 impede their ability to protect their interests;

8 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
9 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting
10 their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT,
11 which may adversely affect an individual's job with
12 DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class Action
13 is the only means to assert their claims through a representative;
14 and,

15 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
16 and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class
17 treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary
18 duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of
19 certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
20 382.

21 38. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action
22 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

23 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS Members because the DEFENDANT's employment practices
26 are applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

27 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair
28 and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the

CALIFORNIA CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;

- (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the Court;
- (d) PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;
- (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;
- (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT; and,
- (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

1 39. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and
2 identify by job title each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally
3 subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged.
4 PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles of
5 similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

6
7 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

8 40. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh,
9 Eighth and Ninth causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members
10 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who are or previously were employed by S&D Carwash
11 Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash
12 Management, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with S&D Carwash
13 Management, LLC and/or Quick Quack Car Wash, Inc. and/or Quick Quack Carwash
14 Management, LLC by a third party, and classified as non exempt employees (the
15 "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any time during the period three (3) years prior
16 to the filing of the complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the
17 "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
18 382. The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
19 CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

20 38. DEFENDANT, in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare
21 Commission ("IWC") Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California
22 law, intentionally, knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT
23 failed to correctly calculate compensation for the time worked by PLAINTIFF and the other
24 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and reporting time wages owed to
25 these employees, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required
26 employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work.
27 DEFENDANT has denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members wages to
28 which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly cheat the competition and unlawfully

1 profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA LABOR
2 SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD
3 should be adjusted accordingly.

4 39. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and
5 identify by name and job title, each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been
6 intentionally subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as
7 herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the complaint to include any
8 additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

9 40. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
10 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

11 41. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
12 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

- 13 (a) Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and
14 pay compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
15 SUB-CLASS for missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the
16 California Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable
17 California Wage Order;
- 18 (b) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other
19 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate
20 itemized wage statements;
- 21 (c) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the
22 above-listed conduct;
- 23 (d) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of
24 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,
- 25 (e) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

26 42. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
27 CLASS under California law by:
28

- 1 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the
2 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
3 CLASS all wages due for overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is
4 liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194;
- 5 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to
6 accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA
7 LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wage pay for which
8 DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
- 9 (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and
10 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an
11 accurate itemized statement in writing showing the corresponding
12 correct amount of wages earned by the employee;
- 13 (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide
14 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
15 SUB-CLASS with all legally required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty
16 (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required off-duty rest breaks;
- 17 (e) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that
18 when an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the
19 employer must pay the employee all wages due without abatement, by
20 failing to tender full payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the
21 manner required by California law to the members of the
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated their
23 employment; and,
- 24 (f) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF
25 and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members with necessary
26 expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties.

27 43. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a
28 Class Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 1 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
2 are so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
3 CLASS Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as
4 a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 5 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief
6 issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply to every member
8 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 9 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims
10 of each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
11 PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
12 SUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who
13 was subjected to the DEFENDANT's practice and policy which failed
14 to pay the correct amount of wages due to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
15 SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a result of
16 DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members
17 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or
18 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, and unfair
19 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,
- 20 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and
21 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and
22 has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in Class
23 Action litigation. There are no material conflicts between the claims of
24 the representative PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA
25 LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make class certification
26 inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
27 will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
28 CLASS Members.

1 44. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action
2 is properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

3 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
4 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution
5 of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA
6 LABOR SUB-CLASS will create the risk of:

7 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
8 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which
9 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
10 parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,

11 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a
13 practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members
14 not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede
15 their ability to protect their interests.

16 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have
17 acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide
19 relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a
20 whole in that DEFENDANT fails to pay all wages due. Including the
21 correct wages for all time worked by the members of the
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;

23 (c) Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of
24 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices
25 and violations of California Law as listed above, and predominate over
26 any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
27 CLASS Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available
28

1 methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy,
2 including consideration of:

- 3 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
4 SUB-CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or
5 defense of separate actions in that the substantial expense of
6 individual actions will be avoided to recover the relatively small
7 amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared
9 to the substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution
10 of this litigation;
- 11 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
12 litigation that would create the risk of:
 - 13 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
14 individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of
16 conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,
 - 17 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a
19 practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other
20 members not parties to the adjudication or substantially
21 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests;
- 22 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
23 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will
24 avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by
25 DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual's job
26 with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class
27 Action is the only means to assert their claims through a
28 representative; and,

1 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
2 and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class
3 treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary
4 duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of
5 certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
6 382.

7 45. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action
8 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 9 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
10 SUB-CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
- 12 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair
13 and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the
14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of
15 employment litigation a substantial number of individual
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting
17 their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on
18 their employment;
- 19 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
20 numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;
- 22 (d) PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
23 Members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal
24 redress unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;
- 25 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
26 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations
27 and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the
28

1 damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted
2 upon the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;

3 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
4 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of
5 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;

6 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally
7 applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby
8 making final class-wide relief appropriate with respect to the
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole;

10 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
11 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA
13 CLASS Members who worked for DEFENDANT in California at any
14 time during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and,

15 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to
16 bring a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and
17 hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to
18 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

19
20 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

22 **[Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*]**

23 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

24 46. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege
25 and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of
26 this Complaint.

27 47. DEFENDANT is a "person" as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. and Prof.
28 Code § 17021.

1 48. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) defines
2 unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section
3 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair
4 competition as follows:

5 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair
6 competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court
7 may make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver,
8 as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by any person of any
9 practice which constitutes unfair competition, as defined in this chapter, or as
10 may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money or property,
11 real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such unfair
12 competition.

13 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

14 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
15 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
16 applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California
17 Labor Code including Sections 204, 210, 221, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
18 1198, 2802 and the Fair Labor Standards Act and federal regulations promulgated
19 thereunder, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant
20 to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct
21 held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

22 50. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were unlawful and
23 unfair in that these practices violate public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive,
24 unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or
25 utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section
26 17203 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages
27 wrongfully withheld.

28 51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were deceptive and
fraudulent in that DEFENDANT’s policy and practice failed to provide the legally
mandated meal and rest periods, the required amount of compensation for missed meal and
rest periods and overtime and minimum wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed

1 to reimburse al necessary business expenses incurred, and failed to provide Fair Labor
2 Standards Act overtime wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing to include non-
3 discretionary incentive compensation into their regular rates of pay for purposes of
4 computing the proper overtime pay due to a business practice that cannot be justified,
5 pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements
6 in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue
7 injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including
8 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

9 52. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
10 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and
11 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment
12 with DEFENDANT.

13 53. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
14 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's policies, practices and procedures failed to
15 provide all legally required meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

17 54. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty
19 meal period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of
20 pay for each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for
21 each ten (10) hours of work.

22 55. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself and each member of the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off
24 duty paid rest period was not timely provided as required by law.

25 56. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
26 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and
27 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time
28 worked, and has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and

1 contract, all to the detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to
2 allow DEFENDANT to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

3 57. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the
4 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the
5 California Labor Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral,
6 unethical, oppressive and unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful,
7 unfair and deceptive business practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et*
8 *seq.*

9 58. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled
10 to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property
11 which DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and
13 unfair business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

14 59. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
15 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful,
16 unfair and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT
17 from engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

18 60. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no
19 plain, speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business
20 practices of DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur
21 unabated. As a result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
22 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will
23 continue to suffer irreparable legal and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained
24 from continuing to engage in these unlawful and unfair business practices.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

27
28

1 implementing a policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and
2 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum
3 wage pay.

4 68. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
5 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
6 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
7 DEFENDANT acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and
8 other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission
9 requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

10 69. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged
11 herein, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did
12 not receive the correct minimum wage compensation for their time worked for
13 DEFENDANT.

14 70. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT
15 required, permitted or suffered PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
16 Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's
17 control. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
18 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked
19 that they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

20 71. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
21 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
22 CLASS for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic
24 injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained
25 according to proof at trial.

26 72. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
27 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for their
28 time worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross

1 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice
2 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF
3 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum
4 wages for their time worked.

5 73. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California
6 labor laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS for all time worked and provide them with the requisite compensation,
8 DEFENDANT acted and continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously
9 toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
10 with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the consequences to them, and
11 with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal rights, and otherwise
12 causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of these employees.

13 74. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
14 CLASS therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest,
15 statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT,
16 in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the
17 extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA
18 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's
19 conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also
20 be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought
21 herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's
22 conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further,
23 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are entitled to seek
24 and recover statutory costs.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]**

4 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
5 **Defendants)**

6 75. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though full set forth herein, the prior
8 paragraphs of this Complaint.

9 76. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the
11 California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for
12 DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all overtime worked, including, work
13 performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday,
14 and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

15 77. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and
16 public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

17 78. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not
18 be employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and more than forty (40) hours per
19 workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in
20 amounts specified by law.

21 79. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid
22 wages, including minimum wage and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together
23 with the costs of suit. Cal. Lab. Code § 1198 further states that the employment of an
24 employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is
25 unlawful.

26 80. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and
27
28

1 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required, permitted or suffered by
2 DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked,
3 including overtime work.

4 81. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without
5 limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of
6 implementing a policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by
7 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members and denied accurate
8 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
9 CLASS for overtime worked, including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8)
10 hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any
11 workweek.

12 82. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
13 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB CLASS Members. DEFENDANT
15 acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in
16 violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and
17 other applicable laws and regulations.

18 As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged
19 herein, the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
20 did not receive full compensation for overtime worked.

21 83. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
22 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the
23 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. Further,
24 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were not
25 subject to a valid collective bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action
26 contained herein this Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of
27 himself and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS based on DEFENDANT's violations
28 of non-negotiable, non-waiveable rights provided by the State of California.

1 84. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and
2 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have been paid less for
3 overtime worked that they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages..

4 85. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay the PLAINTIFF and the other
5 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS overtime wages for the time they
6 worked which was in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal.
7 Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194 & 1198, even though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were required to work, and did in fact work, overtime
9 as to which DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by
10 DEFENDANT's business records and witnessed by employees.

11 86. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
12 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
13 CLASS for the true amount of time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic
15 injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained
16 according to proof at trial.

17 87. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
18 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for all
19 overtime worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
20 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice
21 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF
22 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked.

23 88. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California
24 labor laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
25 CLASS for all overtime worked and provide them with the requisite overtime compensation,
26 DEFENDANT acted and continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously
27 toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
28 with a conscious of and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the consequences to them,

1 and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal rights, and
2 otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of these
3 employees.

4 89. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS therefore request recovery of all overtime wages, according to proof, interest,
6 statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT,
7 in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the
8 extent minimum and/or overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their employment,
10 DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these
11 individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
12 penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
13 Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in
14 good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
15 are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **For Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

18 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

19 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
20 **Defendants)**

21 90. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
22 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
23 paragraphs of this Complaint.

24 91. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT from time to time
25 failed to provide all the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order
27 and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA
28 LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS did not prevent these employees from being relieved of

1 all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous
2 work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
3 were from time to time not fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods.
4 Additionally, DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
5 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th)
6 hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records from time to time. Further,
7 DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a
8 second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were required by
9 DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. As a result, PLAINTIFF
10 and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS therefore forfeited meal
11 breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict
12 corporate policy and practice.

13 92. DEFENDANT further violates California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the
14 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA
15 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with
16 the applicable Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular
17 rate of pay for each workday that a meal period was not provided.

18 93. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according
20 to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of
21 suit.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

4 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
5 **Defendants)**

6 94. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
8 paragraphs of this Complaint.

9 95. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
10 from time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten
11 (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees from time to time were denied their first
12 rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)
13 hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of
14 between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten
15 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time.

16 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not
17 provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules,
18 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically
19 denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

20 96. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the
21 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA
22 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with
23 the applicable Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular
24 rate of pay for each workday that rest period was not provided.

25 97. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according
27 to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of
28 suit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the
2 wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total
3 hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to
4 California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to
5 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members failed to identify
6 such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total
7 hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added
8 up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of
9 Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph,
10 DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the
11 requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time
12 to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
13 CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

14 101. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab.
15 Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs
17 expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount
18 of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities.
19 These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of
20 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty
21 dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred
22 dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §
23 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four
24 thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member of the
25 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS herein).

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 ///

2
3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **For Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

5 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

6 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
7 **Defendants)**

8 102. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members
9 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
10 paragraphs of this Complaint.

11 103. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

12 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary
13 expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the
14 discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the
15 employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying
16 the directions, believed them to be unlawful.

15 104. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802,
16 by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
17 CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for
18 DEFENDANT's benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not
20 limited to, costs related to using their personal cellular phones on behalf of and for the
21 benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR
22 SUB-CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular
23 phones and home offices in order to perform work related job tasks. DEFENDANT's policy
24 and practice was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
25 CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal cellular phones and home
26 offices for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their employment for
27 DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties.
28

1 DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of this
2 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF
3 and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify
4 and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for
5 these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

6 105. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses
7 incurred by himself and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members in the discharge
8 of their job duties for DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT,
9 with interest at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **For Failure to Pay Wages When Due**

12 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203]**

13 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**
14 **and Against All Defendants)**

15 106. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
16 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
17 paragraphs of this Complaint.

18 107. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides, in relevant part, that:
19 As used in this article:

20 (a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of
every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the
21 standard of time, task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.

22 (b) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or
performed under contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other
23 agreement if the labor to be paid for is performed personally by the person
demanding payment.

24 108. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, "that If an employer
discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and
25 payable immediately."

26 109. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

27 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his
28 or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not

1 later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours
2 previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee
3 is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. Notwithstanding any
4 other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-
5 hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so
6 requests and designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall
7 constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide
8 payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

9 110. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA LABOR
10 SUB-CLASS Members' employment contract.

11 111. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides, in relevant part, that:

12 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in
13 accordance with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an
14 employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall
15 continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid
16 or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue
17 for more than 30 days.

18 112. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
19 CLASS Members has terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages
20 owed as required by law.

21 113. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of himself and the
22 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has terminated
23 and who have not been fully paid their wages due to them, PLAINTIFF demands thirty days
24 of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who
25 terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD and
26 demands an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as
27 allowed by law.

28 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-204, 210, 233, 246]

**(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
and Against All Defendants)**

114. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-

1 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
2 paragraphs of this Complaint.

3 115. Cal Lab. Code § 233 provides that an employer must permit an employee to
4 use accrued sick leave in accordance with Cal Lab. Code § 246.5 at the employee's then
5 current rate of entitlement. Cal Lab. Code § 246 provides that an employee is entitled to
6 sick pay wages for use of accrued sick leave pursuant to Cal Lab. Code § 246.5.
7 Specifically, once accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time, an employee has a vested
8 right to sick pay wages, which an employer must calculate and compensate based on one of
9 two calculations: (i) "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the
10 same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid
11 sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek," or (ii)
12 "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated by dividing the employee's
13 total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in
14 the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Under Cal Lab. Code §§ 218 and
15 233, employees may sue to recover underpaid sick pay wages as damages.

16 116. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to
17 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS at the
18 incorrect rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-
19 SUB-CLASS regularly use accrued sick leave in the workweeks in which they also earn
20 non-hourly remuneration. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay
21 wages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS
22 at the base hourly pay, as opposed to the regular rate of pay, which would consider all non-
23 hourly remuneration in addition to base hourly wages, or the rate resulting from dividing the
24 employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours
25 worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. As a result,
26 DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS.

28 117. Cal. Lab. Code § 204 provides that wages generally are due and payable twice

1 during each calendar month and are to be paid no later than the payday for the next regular
2 payroll period. Consistent with Cal. Lab. Code § 204, Cal. Lab. Code § 246 specifically
3 requires that, upon use of accrued sick leave, vested sick pay wages are due and to be paid
4 no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period after accrued sick leave is used
5 as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides that if an employer discharges
6 an employee, wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
7 immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides that an employee is entitled to receive all
8 unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an employee quits his or her employment, unless
9 the employee has given 72-hour notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the
10 employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes
11 untimely payments. For example, Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides that if an employer
12 willfully fails to pay wages owed in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the
13 wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date, and at the same rate
14 until paid, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days. Likewise, Cal.
15 Lab. Code § 210 provides penalties for violations of Cal. Lab. Code § 204 and untimely
16 payments during employment. Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203, 210 and 218, employees may
17 sue to recover applicable penalties.

18 118. As alleged herein and as a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT
19 routinely underpays sick pay wages and thus did not timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other
20 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all owing and underpaid sick pay
21 wages. As a result, DEFENDANT violates Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-204, 210, 233, and 246,
22 among other Labor Code provisions. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that
23 DEFENDANT was advised by skilled lawyers and knew, or should have known, of the
24 mandates of the Labor Code as it relates to PLAINTIFF's allegations, especially since the
25 California Supreme Court has explained that "[c]ourts have recognized that 'wages' also
26 include those benefits to which an employee is entitled as a part of his or her compensation,
27 including money, room, board, clothing, vacation pay, and sick pay." *Murphy v. Kenneth*
28 *Cole Prods., Inc.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1103 (2007)(emphasis added). Because DEFENDANT

1 willfully fails to timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR-SUB-CLASS all sick pay wages due, DEFENDANT is subject to applicable
3 penalties.

4 119. Such a pattern, practice, and uniform administration of corporate policy is
5 unlawful and entitles PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-
6 SUB-CLASS to underpaid sick pay wages, including interest thereon, applicable penalties,
7 attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

8
9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and
11 severally, as follows:

12 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 13 A) That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
15 B) An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
16 DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
17 C) An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully
18 withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and,
20 D) Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund
21 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to
22 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

23 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:

- 24 A) That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth
25 and Ninth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
27 B) Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
28 damages for minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFF and the other

members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;

C) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;

D) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;

E) For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and 1197;

F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.; and,

G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

3. On all claims:

A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;

B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,

C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §221, §226, §1194, and/or §2802.

Dated: January 17, 2023
LLP

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW

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

By: _____
Nicholas J. De Blouw
Attorneys for Plaintiff
DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF demands a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

Dated: January 17, 2023

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: _____
Nicholas J. De Blouw
Attorneys for Plaintiff