

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
jyslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Aram Boyadjian (SBN 334009)
aboyadjian@wilshirelawfirm.com
Andrew Sandoval (SBN 346996)
andrew.sandoval@wilshirelawfirm.com

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

ELIJAH BAER, JOSHUA BAYANGOS,
RONALD GRUEL, ISAIAH HAMPTON,
NATHAN JOHNSON, CHANDRASEKAR
KUPPUCHAMY, DEREK LEWIS, DESERIE
MARTIN, JOSEPH MARTINEZ, MAYRENI
MORALES, SHONTAE STEPHENS, SIENNA
STEPHENS, RUDY VALDEZ, JATEL
VERCHER, and KAYLA WILLIAMS,
individually, and on behalf of all others similarly
situated, and on behalf of the State of California
and other aggrieved persons,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TESLA MOTORS, INC., a California
corporation, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 22CV024984

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS &
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
5. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226);
7. Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures (Cal. Lab. Code § 2802)
8. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and,
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA (Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs ELIJAH BAER, JOSHUA BAYANGOS, RONALD GRUEL, ISAIAH
2 HAMPTON, NATHAN JOHNSON, CHANDRASEKAR KUPPUCHAMY, DEREK LEWIS,
3 DESERIE MARTIN, JOSEPH MARTINEZ, MAYRENI MORALES, SHONTAE STEPHENS,
4 SIENNA STEPHENS, RUDY VALDEZ, JATEL VERCHER, and KAYLA WILLIAMS,
5 (“Plaintiffs”), on information and belief, allege as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

7 1. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendant TESLA MOTORS, INC., and DOES
8 1 through 10 (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code
9 violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay for all hours
10 worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods, failure to
11 authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay final wages, failure to furnish accurate wage
12 statements, failure to indemnify employees for expenditures, and failure to produce requested
13 employment records.

14 2. Plaintiffs bring the First through Eight Causes of Action individually and as a class
15 action on behalf of themselves and certain current and former employees of Defendants
16 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” and defined more fully
17 below). The Class consists of Plaintiffs and all other persons who have been employed by any
18 Defendants in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee during the statute of
19 limitations period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

20 3. Plaintiffs brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
21 California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
22 them, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt employees employed by Defendants
23 in the State of California during the statute of limitations period for their PAGA claim (hereinafter
24 referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

25 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
26 establishment within the State of California, including Alameda County. As such, and based upon
27 all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are
28

1 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
2 (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

3 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained
4 a systematic, company-wide pattern and practice of:

- 5 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum,
6 straight time, and overtime in compliance with the California Labor Code
7 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 8 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
9 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
10 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing
11 to pay an additional hour’s pay for each workday a meal period violation
12 occurred;
- 13 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
14 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
15 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour’s pay for each workday a rest
16 period violation occurred;
- 17 (d) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum, straight time, overtime,
18 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages due within the time
19 period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- 20 (e) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
21 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
22 IWC Wage Orders; and,
- 23 (f) Failing to indemnify employees for expenditures incurred in direct discharge
24 of duties of employment.

25 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
26 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
27 unlawful policies. Defendants’ violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were
28 willful and deliberate.

7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior.”

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

8. Plaintiff Elijah Baer is a resident of San Jose, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2022 to present.

9. Plaintiff Joshua Bayangos is a resident of Antioch, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2022 to approximately March 2022.

10. Plaintiff Ronald Gruel is a resident of Hayward, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2018 to approximately December 2021.

11. Plaintiff Isaiah Hampton is a resident of Salinas, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately July 2022 to approximately November 2022.

12. Plaintiff Nathan Johnson is a resident of Modesto, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately July 2020 to approximately August 2022.

13. Plaintiff Chandrasekar Kuppuchamy is a resident of Newark, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2021 to approximately August 2022.

14. Plaintiff Derek Lewis is a resident of San Jose, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately October 2018 to present.

15. Plaintiff Deserie Martin is a resident of Fremont, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately January 2021 to approximately October 2022.

16. Plaintiff Joseph Martinez is a resident of Oakland, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2022 to present.

17. Plaintiff Mayreni Morales is a resident of Oakland, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2017 to approximately August 2022.

18. Plaintiff Shontae Stephens is a resident of Milpitas, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2020 to approximately December 2020.

19. Plaintiff Sienna Stephens is a resident of Milpitas, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2020 to approximately December 2020.

20. Plaintiff Rudy Valdez is a resident of Victorville, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately April 2022 to approximately November 2022.

21. Plaintiff Jatel Vercher is a resident of Lathrop, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately December 2021 to approximately November 2022.

22. Plaintiff Kayla Williams is a resident of Oakland, California who worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately June 2021 to approximately September 2022.

23. Plaintiffs reserve the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new Plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

1 **B. Defendants**

2 24. Plaintiffs are informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
3 alleges, that Defendant TESLA MOTORS, INC. is, and at all times herein mentioned, was:

4 (a) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
5 State of California, including Alameda County; and,

6 (b) The former employer of Plaintiffs, and the current and/or former employer
7 of the putative Class because Defendant TESLA MOTORS, INC.. suffered
8 and permitted Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work,
9 and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

10 25. Plaintiffs do not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued
11 herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each
12 of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by
13 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiffs will amend this
14 complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been
15 ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

16 26. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
17 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
18 injured a significant number of the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the State
19 of California.

20 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times
21 each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiffs and
22 the other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their
23 wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and thereon alleges
24 that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer,
25 director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest
26 and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some
27 or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to
28 some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters

1 alleged below. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted
2 pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or
3 should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and
4 abetted the conduct of all other Defendants and/or all Defendants were joint employers.

5 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

6 28. Plaintiff Elijah Baer worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an
7 hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2022 to present.

8 29. Plaintiff Joshua Bayangos worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California
9 as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2022 to approximately
10 March 2022.

11 30. Plaintiff Ronald Gruel worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an
12 hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2018 to approximately
13 December 2021.

14 31. Plaintiff Isaiah Hampton worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as
15 an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately July 2022 to approximately November
16 2022.

17 32. Plaintiff Nathan Johnson worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as
18 an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately July 2020 to approximately August
19 2022.

20 33. Plaintiff Chandrasekar Kuppuchamy worked for Defendants in Alameda County,
21 California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2021 to
22 approximately August 2022.

23 34. Plaintiff Derek Lewis worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an
24 hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately October 2018 to present.

25 35. Plaintiff Deserie Martin worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as
26 an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately January 2021 to approximately October
27 2022.

1 36. Plaintiff Joseph Martinez worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as
2 an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2022 to present.

3 37. Plaintiff Mayreni Morales worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California
4 as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2017 to approximately
5 August 2022.

6 38. Plaintiff Shontae Stephens worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California
7 as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2020 to approximately
8 December 2020.

9 39. Plaintiff Sienna Stephens worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as
10 an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately September 2020 to approximately
11 December 2020.

12 40. Plaintiff Rudy Valdez worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an
13 hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately April 2022 to approximately November
14 2022.

15 41. Plaintiff Jatel Vercher worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as an
16 hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately December 2021 to approximately
17 November 2022.

18 42. Plaintiff Kayla Williams worked for Defendants in Alameda County, California as
19 an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately June 2021 to approximately September
20 2022.

21 43. During Plaintiffs' employment for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiffs an hourly
22 wage and classified them as non-exempt from overtime. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiffs
23 to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiffs also worked
24 more than eight hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

25 44. Throughout Plaintiffs' employment, Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked
26 (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiffs with legally
27 compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take rest periods, failed to
28 timely pay all final wages to Plaintiffs when Defendants terminated their employment, failed to

1 furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs, failed to indemnify Plaintiffs for expenditures, and
2 failed to produce requested employment records. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience
3 working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

4 45. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a pattern and practice of
5 not paying Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including
6 minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
7 Aggrieved Employees to work "off-the-clock," uncompensated, by, for example, requiring
8 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work during uncompensated meal
9 periods and rest periods. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In
10 failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours
11 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

12 46. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs,
13 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and
14 duty-free meal period in a manner required by law (and also including but not limited to failing to
15 provide Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to leave the work
16 premises to take meal periods). Defendants also continued to assert control over Plaintiffs, the
17 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees by, among other things, requiring, pressuring, or encouraging
18 them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking
19 mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
20 permission to take a meal period under the conditions required by law, and without properly
21 compensating Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not
22 provided as required by law. Defendants also never informed Plaintiffs of their right to, nor
23 permitted them to take, a second meal period when Plaintiffs worked at least ten hours of work in
24 a workday and otherwise unlawfully pressured them to waive such breaks. Accordingly,
25 Defendants' pattern and practice was not to provide meal periods to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
26 Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

27 47. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
28 and permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest

1 periods in a manner required by law (and also including but not limited to failing to authorize and
2 permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to leave the work
3 premises to take rest periods). Defendants regularly required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
4 Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants
5 authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every
6 four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs, the Class,
7 and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead,
8 Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees by
9 requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed
10 without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Plaintiffs, the Class, and
11 the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendants' pattern and
12 practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take
13 rest periods in compliance with California law.

14 48. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
15 pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all final wages due at their termination of
16 employment. In addition, Plaintiffs' final paychecks did not include payment for all expenditures,
17 minimum wages, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
18 period premium wages owed to them by Defendants at the conclusion of their employment. On
19 information and belief, Defendants' failure to timely pay Plaintiffs' final wages when their
20 employment terminated was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead consistent with
21 Defendants' pattern and practice that applied to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

22 49. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiffs, the Class,
23 and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable
24 hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages
25 for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for
26 rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law). As
27 a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
28 Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they were entitled;
- (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;
- (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were entitled;
- (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages owed to them;
- (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;
- (g) by understating the wages truly due to them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wage rates to which Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e).

50. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including, without limitation, work attires.

51. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

52. Plaintiffs bring certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

53. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiffs seek relief authorized by California law.

54. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

All persons who worked for any Defendants in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years and 178 days before the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class is sent.¹

55. At all material times, Plaintiffs were members of the Class.

56. Plaintiffs undertake this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

57. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is readily ascertainable:

- (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.

¹ In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California adopted Emergency Rule 9(a) (California Rules of Court), whereby “statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 to October 1, 2020.”

The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be greater than forty (40) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.

(b) Typicality: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiffs' claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

(c) Adequacy: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs have no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiffs' attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiffs have incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

(d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and,
- 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

58. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages;
- (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
- (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to Class Members;
- (d) Failed to provide Class Members with timely final wages;
- (e) Failed to provide Class Members with accurate wage statements;
- (f) Failed to indemnify Class Members for expenditures; and,
- (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

59. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and

efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;

- (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiffs, and the other members of the Class, 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 statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of:
 - 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or,
 - 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the class as a whole.

60. Plaintiffs contemplate the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated

1 notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiffs contemplates the use of
2 additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail
3 notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the
4 Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time**
7 **Wages for All Hours Worked)**

8 61. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
9 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

10 62. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of
11 an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or
12 not required to do so.

13 63. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to
14 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees compensation for all hours they worked. By
15 their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully
16 violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 1194, and any additional applicable Wage
17 Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

18 64. Accordingly, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
19 recover minimum and straight time wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

20 65. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
21 Aggrieved Employees have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their
22 employment with Defendants.

23 66. By virtue of the Defendants’ unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to
24 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their non-overtime hours worked without
25 pay, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered, and will continue to suffer,
26 damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
27 Employees and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

28 ///

67. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code § 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage compensation due Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

68. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

69. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum and straight time wages. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all such wages due and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

70. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum and straight time wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

71. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

72. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

73. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

///

74. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as employees of Defendants.

75. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198.

76. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate compensation to the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

77. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

78. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees also request recovery of overtime compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

79. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)

80. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

81. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the tenth hour of work in the workday. California Labor Code § 512, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

82. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

83. Under California law, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)

84. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

85. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). California Labor Code § 512, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten minutes each for each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for

1 an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage
2 Order.

3 86. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiffs, the
4 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked
5 more than four hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs, the Class,
6 and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that
7 Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods),
8 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable
9 Wage Orders.

10 87. Under California law, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are
11 entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided
12 with all required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

13 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged**
15 **Employees – Waiting Time Penalties)**

16 88. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
17 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

18 89. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
19 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due
20 and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or
21 her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless
22 the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
23 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

24 90. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of many other members
25 of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will
26 be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail to pay
27 terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California Labor
28

Code §§ 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

91. Defendants' failure to pay those Class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

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

93. The Class is entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

94. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, the Class is also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)

95. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

96. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee

1 and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number
2 other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the
3 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
4 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

5 97. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
6 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure
7 to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees,
8 the failure to list the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net
9 wages earned.

10 98. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiffs,
11 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily
12 protected rights.

13 99. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have been injured by
14 Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both
15 their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage
16 statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

17 100. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
18 Employees is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiffs, the
19 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to
20 attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants’ refusal to comply with many of
21 the mandates of California’s Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

22 101. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from
23 Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with
24 California Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars
25 (\$4,000) per employee.

26 102. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to injunctive
27 relief, as well as an award of attorney’s fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section,
28 pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures)

103. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

104. As set forth above, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to incur substantial necessary expenditures and losses in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

105. Defendants violated California Labor Code § 2802, by failing to pay and indemnify Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

106. As a result, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were damaged at least in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

107. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802(c) and interest pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802(b).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

108. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

109. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

110. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiffs seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil

1 Procedure § 1021.5.

2 111. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and
3 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
4 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

5 112. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
6 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations
7 of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy;
8 and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby
9 constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business
10 & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

11 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages**

12 113. Defendants' failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, and other benefits in
13 violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by
14 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

15 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

16 114. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of
17 California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
18 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

19 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

20 115. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
21 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or
22 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

23 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

24 116. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
25 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
26 and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

27 **Failure to Indemnify Business Expenses**

28 117. Defendants' failure to reimburse expenses incurred in accordance with California

1 Labor Code § 2802, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by
2 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

3 118. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
4 herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiffs, and
5 all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiffs, and all persons similarly situated, of
6 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

7 119. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees Members suffered monetary
8 injury as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

9 120. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled
10 to, and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
11 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
12 Employees have been deprived, by means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or
13 fraudulent business practices. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are not obligated
14 to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of Defendants in order to recover
15 restitution.

16 121. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, is further
17 entitled to and does seek a declaration that the above-described business practices are unfair,
18 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,
19 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices
20 in the future.

21 122. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, has no plain,
22 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members suffered
23 as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a
24 result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiffs,
25 individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and will continue to
26 suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to
27 engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

28 ///

123. Plaintiffs also allege that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other withholdings.

124. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiffs and putative Class Members is entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years and 178 days prior to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiffs and Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiffs Against All Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698, et seq.)

125. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 51 in this Complaint.

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

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

128. Plaintiffs have given written notice by online filing pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiffs and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiffs also paid the filing fee.

130. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of herself, the State of California, and similarly situated Aggrieved Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

131. In addition, Plaintiffs seeks an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, “Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.”

Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;

2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as the representative of the Class; and,

3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel.

4. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum and straight time wages due;

5. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due:

7. For liquidated damages;

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

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

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due;

11. For unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

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

13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

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

As to the Third Cause of Action

15. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

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

18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

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

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

20. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

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

23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

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

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;

26. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;

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

28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

31. For all actual damages, according to proof;

32. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

33. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

34. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code § 2802 by willfully failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;

37. For unpaid wages or unreimbursed business expenses as may be appropriate;

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

39. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

41. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;

42. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

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

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

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

47. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime), failing to provide meal periods and pay the correct amount of meal period premium wages, failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay the correct amount of rest period premium wages, failing to pay all earned wages twice per month, failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failing to pay all final wages to terminated employees, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;

- 1 48. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
- 2 49. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, et seq., and all
- 3 other applicable Labor Code provisions;
- 4 50. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
- 5 California Labor Code § 2699; and,
- 6 51. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

7 As to all Causes of Action

- 8 52. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.
- 9

10 Respectfully submitted,

11 Dated: February 16, 2023

12 **WILSHIRE LAW FIRM**

13 By: _____

14 John G. Yslas
15 Aram Boyadjian
16 Andrew Sandoval

17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

18 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

19 Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

20 Dated: February 16, 2023

21 **WILSHIRE LAW FIRM**

22 By: _____

23 John G. Yslas
24 Aram Boyadjian
25 Andrew Sandoval

26 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

27

28