

February 3, 2026

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION AND MAIL:<https://dir.tfaforms.net/128> (copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

MobileOne, LLC
7817 Ivanhoe, Ste. 320
La Jolla, CA 92037
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5870 4461 46

MobileOne, LLC
Tracy A. Warren, Agent for Service of Process
655 W. Broadway, Suite 1625
San Diego, CA 92101
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5870 4461 39

LWDA Case No.: LWDA-CM-1119476-25**Re: Labor Code § 2698, et seq. Penalties – Amended PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA
Rodolfo Bobadilla**

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiff Rodolfo Bobadilla (“Plaintiff”) and other similarly situated aggrieved employees collectively “Aggrieved Employees”) for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

The purpose of this amended letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* (“the Act”). Unless specified below, Plaintiff would like to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendants, MobileOne, LLC., and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as “Defendants”).

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act, along Plaintiff’s Class and PAGA Action Complaint, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein. The Complaint is being concurrently filed in Santa Clara County Superior Court



and will be assigned a local case number. The Complaint allegations and claims are incorporated into this Notice Letter.

We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. The Class Action Complaint provides the details of Plaintiff's class-wide claims and claims under the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It, along with this Notice Letter, addresses in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as "Aggrieved Employees").

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.

Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to make outreach and prospecting calls to neighborhood schools on weekends and communicate with team members after clocking out for the day. Defendants required Aggrieved Employees to use their cellular phones, off-the-clock, for communicating with management and co-workers regarding work-related activities, including through the use of applications that Aggrieved Employees were required to download on their cellular phones. Additionally, several times per week, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to participate in various conference calls, off-the-clock, prior to clocking out for work. Aggrieved Employees were also required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods, which were systemically denied.

This uncompensated time caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Aggrieved Employees to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees overtime wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees earned commissions in addition to their hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted for when determining Aggrieved Employees' regular rates of pay, and respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with California Law. Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work and were denied a second meal period when they worked over ten hours per day. Aggrieved Employees' meal periods were also periodically delayed and interrupted by work assignments, or they were required to clock out for meal periods but continue working in order to complete various assigned tasks. Additionally, Defendants unlawfully manipulated Aggrieved Employees' time entries and automatically deducted 30 minutes from their shift to reflect compliant meal periods at the proper times, as



required by California law, even though Aggrieved Employees did not take such timely meal periods.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; and (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised Aggrieved Employees of their meal and rest period rights.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take rest breaks in compliance with the California Law. Aggrieved Employees were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Aggrieved Employees of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of delaying the commencement of Aggrieved Employees' rest breaks due to the mandatory and uncompensated pre-shift duties discussed above and the ongoing interruptions of rest periods by work assignments.

Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of unlawfully receiving and/or collecting wages from Aggrieved Employees. Specifically, Defendants withheld taxes from reimbursements, which were paid to Aggrieved Employees.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage statements as "a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing." Additionally, the wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees were not recorded in "ink or other indelible form."

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as "gross wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as "total hours worked by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as "net wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as "all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by



the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters. Plaintiff’s and Aggrieved Employees’ wage statement were only provided in electronic format in violation of Labor Code § 226.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12 month period of work.

Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendants’ employ. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to use their cellular phones to communicate with co-workers and supervisors regarding job-related activities and participate in conference calls. Aggrieved Employees were also required to pay the costs of maintaining and cleaning their uniforms necessary to perform, their duties under Defendants’ employ. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees also had to incur fuel and mileage costs in having to drive to Defendants’ various locations for managers’ meetings. Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses.

Defendants also failed to provide suitable seating to Aggrieved Employees. The operations at Defendants’ facilities allowed for the presence and use of a stool or seat by Aggrieved Employees during the performance of their work duties. The nature of the effected job positions can reasonably be accomplished while using a seat or stool. However, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees suitable seating when the nature of these employees’ work reasonably permitted sitting.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above and in further detail in the Class Action Complaint, the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:¹

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states, “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.

¹ Plaintiff hereby reserves the right to seek penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for Defendants’ violations of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code, suffered by Aggrieved Employees, but not directly suffered by Plaintiff under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.



In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines “Hours Worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states: “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: “Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit.”

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.

Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to make outreach and prospecting calls to neighborhood schools on weekends and communicate with team members after clocking out for the day. Defendants required Aggrieved Employees to use their cellular phones, off-the-clock, for communicating with management and co-workers regarding work-related activities, including through the use of applications that Aggrieved Employees were required to download on their cellular phones. Additionally, several times per week, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to participate in various conference calls, off-the-clock, prior to clocking out for work. Aggrieved Employees were also required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods, which were systemically denied.

Defendants have the ability to pay minimum and overtime wages for all time worked and have willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Aggrieved Employees.

In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages),



liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees consistently worked in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week. However, Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code § 510 and applicable Wage Orders.

Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to make outreach and prospecting calls to neighborhood schools on weekends and communicate with team members after clocking out for the day. Defendants required Aggrieved Employees to use their cellular phones, off-the-clock, for communicating with management and co-workers regarding work-related activities, including through the use of applications that Aggrieved Employees were required to download on their cellular phones. Additionally, several times per week, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to participate in various conference calls, off-the-clock, prior to clocking out for work. Aggrieved Employees were also required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods, which were systemically denied.

Defendants also failed to Aggrieved Employees overtime wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees earned commissions in addition to their hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted for when determining Aggrieved Employees' regular rates of pay, and respective and proper overtime rates of pay.



Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above and by under-reporting actual hours worked. With work shifts generally requiring eight hours or more of work on a given day, this unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of 8, 10, and 12 hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with California Law. Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work and were denied a second meal period when they worked over ten hours per day. Aggrieved Employees' meal periods were also periodically delayed and interrupted by work assignments, or they were required to clock out for meal periods but continue working in order to complete various assigned tasks. Additionally, Defendants unlawfully manipulated Aggrieved Employees' time entries and automatically deducted 30 minutes from their shift to reflect compliant meal periods at the proper times, as required by California law, even though Aggrieved Employees did not take such timely meal



periods.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; and (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised Aggrieved Employees of their meal and rest period rights.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than 10 minutes for every work period of 4 or more consecutive hours, as required by Labor Code. Aggrieved Employees were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Aggrieved Employees of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of delaying the commencement of Aggrieved Employees' rest breaks due to the mandatory and uncompensated pre-shift duties discussed above and the ongoing interruptions of rest periods by work assignments.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558,



including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Proper Sick Time

Labor Code Section 246 affords an employee “who works in California for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment [] paid sick days . . . of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked” and “no less than 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month period.”

Additionally, Subsection (l) of Section 246 provides:

For the purposes of this section, an employer shall calculate paid sick leave using any of the following calculations:

(1) Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12 month period of work.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 246, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 246, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unlawful Receipt and Collection of Wages in Violation of Labor Code § 221

Labor Code § 221 provides, “It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee.”

Defendants had a common policy and practice of unlawfully receiving and/or collecting wages from Aggrieved Employees. Specifically, Defendants withheld taxes from reimbursements, which were paid to Aggrieved Employees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages owed, including all unlawfully deducted, received, and/or collected amounts due and owing to Aggrieved Employees, under Labor Code §§ 221, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802

Defendants have consistently required Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business expenses in the execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to use their cellular phones to communicate with co-workers and supervisors



regarding job-related activities and participate in conference calls. Aggrieved Employees were also required to pay the costs of maintaining and cleaning their uniforms necessary to perform, their duties under Defendants' employ. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees also had to incur fuel and mileage costs in having to drive to Defendants' various locations for managers' meetings, all necessary to perform, their duties under Defendants' employ. Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiff seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. The wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages, overtime, premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks.

Additionally, for the purposes of Subsection (a)(9), Plaintiff seeks to expand the scope of the Aggrieved Employees she seeks to represent to extend to all individuals employed by Defendants during the applicable period. The wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees failed to state all applicable hourly rates for which Aggrieved Employees were paid as required by Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover 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) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ..."

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday or miscalculated these premiums by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants' systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code § 204 and § 226.

Given the above described off the clock work, Plaintiff was not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours he worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and that he was not paid all double time owed either. Defendants' uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the foregoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved



Employees minimum wages and overtime, off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, premium pay, etc., and by not recording meal period start and end times, all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code



§ 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Provide Suitable Seating

Plaintiff also alleges that operations at Defendants' facilities allowed for the presence and use of a stool or seat by the Aggrieved Employees during the performance of their work duties. The nature of the effected job positions can reasonably be accomplished while using a seat or stool. California Labor Code § 1198 requires that ". . . the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the . . . standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful." Paragraph (14)(A) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provides that "[a]ll working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats." Paragraph 14(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provides that "[w]hen employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees suitable seating when the nature of these employees' work reasonably permitted sitting. Defendants knew or should have known that Aggrieved Employees were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties, and that Defendants did not provide suitable seating and did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties.

With their conduct, Defendants have violated California Labor Code § 1198 and Paragraph 14 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to provide suitable seating to Aggrieved Employees. Defendants have violated the California Labor Code, including Section 1198, and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged, including Paragraph 14 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

///



Plaintiff's PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 et seq. and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

The Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802, including as follows:

(a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked, failure to pay proper reporting time and sick pay under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 221, 510, 515, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...";



(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5 and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

We have been constrained to initially move forward with the filing of this Complaint, alleging the causes of action discussed herein, without the PAGA claim. Thus, any action by the LWDA would not resolve the entirety of the case, and the interest of judicial economy will be served by allowing the case to proceed as a cohesive whole.

This letter and the attached Complaint therefore provide the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Defendants and joint employers. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether the Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

David Arakelyan

Cc: **MobileOne, LLC**, by Certified Mail

1 **D.LAW, INC.**
David Keledjian (SBN 309135)
2 d.keledjian@d.law
David Arakelyan (SBN 337076)
3 d.arakelyan@d.law
4 450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
5 Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469
6

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff RODOLFO BOBADILLA

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**
10

11 RODOLFO BOBADILLA, on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated, and
12 the general public,

13 *Plaintiff,*

14 v.

15 MOBILEONE, LLC, an Arizona corporation;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,
16

17 *Defendants.*
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No.:

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198);
3. Failure to Pay Hourly Wages and Overtime (Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198);
4. Failure to Pay Proper Sick Pay (Lab. Code § 246);
5. Unlawful Collection or Receipt of Wages (Lab. Code § 221);
6. Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203);
7. Failure to Indemnify (Lab. Code § 2802);
8. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*) and
9. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff RODOLFO BOBADILLA (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself, and all others similarly
2 situated, the State of California, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action against Defendants MOBILEONE,
5 LLC, an Arizona corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively referred to as
6 “Defendants”) for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and California Business and
7 Professions Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have:

- 8 a. failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;
- 9 b. failed to pay them double time wages at the correct rate;
- 10 c. failed to pay them overtime and/or double time wages by failing to include all
11 applicable remuneration in calculating the regular rate of pay;
- 12 d. failed to provide them with meal periods;
- 13 e. failed to provide them with rest periods;
- 14 f. failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and rest periods;
- 15 g. failed to pay them proper sick time pay;
- 16 h. unlawfully collected and received wages;
- 17 i. failed to reimburse them with necessary business expenditures;
- 18 j. failed to pay them all their final wages following separation of employment.

19 Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class and
20 representative action to recover unpaid wages, liquidated damages, civil and statutory penalties,
21 restitution, and related relief on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, the State of California,
22 and the general public.

23 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

24 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the monetary
25 damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff from Defendants’ conduct exceeds the minimal
26 jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.

27 3. Venue is proper in the County of Santa Clara pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
28 sections 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose this county because at least some of the transactions

1 that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found,
2 maintains offices, transacts business and/or has an agent therein.

3 4. Venue is proper in Santa Clara County because Defendants' have at all times alleged
4 herein, conducted business in Santa Clara County, and throughout California. As such, venue is
5 proper in any county in California.

6 **PARTIES**

7 5. Plaintiff RODOLFO BOBADILLA is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, an
8 individual residing in the State of California.

9 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant
10 MOBILEONE, LLC is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, an Arizona corporation doing
11 business in the State of California.

12 7. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as
13 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff
14 will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when
15 ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that each of the fictitiously
16 named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged
17 herein and that Plaintiff's alleged damages were proximately caused by these defendants, and each of
18 them. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege both the true names and capacities of the DOE
19 defendants when ascertained.

20 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
21 mentioned herein, some or all of the defendants were the representatives, agents, employees, partners,
22 directors, associates, joint venturers, joint employers, owners, principals or co-participants of some
23 or all of the other defendants, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting within the course
24 and scope of such relationship and with the full knowledge, consent, and ratification by such other
25 defendants.

26 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
27 mentioned herein, some of the defendants pursued a common course of conduct, acted in concert and
28 conspired with one another, and aided and abetted one another to accomplish the occurrences, acts

1 and omissions alleged herein.

2 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted in all
3 respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, that Defendants carried out a
4 joint scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and that the acts of each
5 Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants acted in all
6 respects as the employers or joint employers of Employees. Defendants, and each of them, exercised
7 control over the wages, hours or working conditions of Employees, or suffered or permitted
8 Employees to work, or engaged, thereby creating a common law employment relationship, with
9 Employees. Therefore, Defendants, and each of them, employed or jointly employed Employees.

10 11. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Code
11 of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest among the
12 persons who comprise the readily ascertainable classes defined below and because Plaintiff is
13 unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in managing this case as a class action.

14 12. **Relevant Time Period:** The relevant time period is defined as the time period
15 beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until judgment is entered.

- 16 a. **Hourly Employee Class:** All persons employed by Defendants, collectively or
17 separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in hourly or
18 non-exempt positions in California four years prior to the filing of this action and
ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action (“Hourly Employee
Class”).
- 19 b. **Meal Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked in
20 a shift in excess of five hours during the four years prior to the filing of this action
and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 21 c. **Rest Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked a
22 shift of at least three and one-half (3.5) hours the four years prior to the filing of
this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 23 d. **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
24 separated from their employment with Defendants during the period beginning
25 three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is
entered.
- 26 e. **Sick-Pay Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California who, at any
27 time from four years prior to the filing of this action and ending on the date that
28 final judgment is entered in this action, worked for more than 30 days for
Defendants, and were not paid for at least one hour of sick time for every 30 hours
of work thereafter, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12-month period of
employment.

- 1 f. **Unlawful Deduction Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members whose
2 wages were deducted for uniform payments at anytime from four year prior to the
3 filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
4 action.
- 5 g. **Expense Reimbursement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in
6 California who incurred business expenses during the **Relevant Time Period**.
- 7 h. **UCL Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** and **Expense Reimbursement Class**
8 members employed by Defendants in California during the four years prior to the
9 filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
10 action.

11 13. **Reservation of Rights:** Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the right
12 to amend or modify the class definitions with greater specificity, by further division into sub-classes
13 and/or by limitation to particular issues.

14 14. **Numerosity:** The class members are so numerous that the individual joinder of each
15 individual class member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact number of
16 class members, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that the actual number
17 exceeds the minimum required for numerosity under California law.

18 15. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all
19 class members and predominate over any questions which affect only individual class members.
20 These common questions include, but are not limited to:

- 21 a. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
22 employees with their rest periods;
- 23 b. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
24 employees with their meal periods;
- 25 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members when they
26 have not been provided with meal and rest periods at the appropriate rates of pay;
- 27 d. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class
28 members for all time worked;
- e. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of unlawfully collecting
and/or receiving wages;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to pay proper sick time pay;

- 1 g. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse class members for all necessary business
2 expenses incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- 3 h. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under
4 Labor Code section 203; and
- 5 i. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that
6 Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition;

7 16. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other class members' claims. Plaintiff
8 is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants have a policy or practice of failing
9 to comply with the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code as alleged in this
10 Complaint.

11 17. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative and
12 has no interests that are adverse to, or otherwise conflict with, the interests of absent class members
13 and is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on their behalf. Plaintiff will fairly and
14 adequately represent and protect the interests of the other class members.

15 18. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that
16 they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent class members, are experienced in
17 wage and hour class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf
18 of Plaintiff and absent class members.

19 19. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and
20 efficient adjudication of the class members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the
21 Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to simultaneously and
22 efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the unnecessary duplication of
23 effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the monetary amounts
24 due to many individual class members are likely to be relatively small and would thus make it
25 difficult, if not impossible, for individual class members to both seek and obtain relief. Moreover, a
26 class action will serve an important public interest by permitting class members to effectively pursue
27 the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will prevent the potential for inconsistent
28 or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

1 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

2 20. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a non-exempt employee during the relevant and
3 statutory periods.

4 21. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff
5 and Class Members proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First,
6 Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and
7 reduced the actual working hours recorded by Plaintiff and Class Members, and upon which their pay
8 was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Plaintiff and Class Members, and these
9 unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage
10 statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying
11 Plaintiff and Class members only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours
12 they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and results,
13 over time, to the detriment of the Plaintiff and Class members by systematically undercompensating
14 them. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to work on their meal breaks and
15 Defendants' Management adjusted Plaintiff and Class Members' time cards to reflect compliant meal
16 periods, despite the employees not actually taking them.

17 22. Next, Plaintiff and Class Members were also consistently required to perform work,
18 off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff and
19 Class Members to perform work during their unpaid meal periods, for which they were not
20 compensated any wages. After clocking out for they day, Plaintiff and Class Members were required
21 to communicate with team members, complete scheduling as well as return to the store to complete
22 work-related duties. On the days they were not scheduled to work, Defendants required Plaintiff and
23 Class Members to conduct outreach and prospecting calls at neighborhood schools, off-the-clock, and
24 even participate in conference calls prior to the beginning of their shifts. Moreover, Defendants
25 required Plaintiff and Class Members to cover shifts for other Class Members prior to their own
26 regularly scheduled shifts, for which they were not paid wages. The foregoing and uncompensated
27 working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

28 ///

1 23. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of
2 eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Plaintiff
3 and Class Members to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

4 24. Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members overtime wages at the
5 proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members earned
6 commissions, spiff pay, as well as performance-based non-discretionary bonuses in addition to their
7 hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted for when determining Plaintiff
8 and Class Members' regular rates of pay, and respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

9 25. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
10 Class Members the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law.
11 Specifically, due to understaffing, heavy workloads, and the pre-shift duties noted above, Plaintiff
12 and Class Members were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion
13 of their fifth hour of work. Furthermore, Plaintiff and Class Members were not relieved of all work
14 duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep working during meal breaks. Defendants
15 also automatically deducted 30 minutes from Plaintiff's and Class Members and altered their time
16 entries accordingly in order to show compliant meal periods were being taken. Lastly, Plaintiff and
17 Class Members were denied first and second meal periods altogether.

18 26. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30)
19 minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal
20 period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to
21 take their meal periods, or that advised Class Members of their meal and rest period rights; and (3)
22 Defendants' practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their meal
23 periods due to the excessive workload and the automatic deduction for meal periods.

24 27. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
25 Class Members the opportunity to take rest periods in compliance with the California Law. Plaintiff
26 and Class Members were not provided with first and second rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes
27 for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not
28 scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six

1 (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to
2 take their rest periods, or that properly advised Plaintiff and Class Members of their rest period rights;
3 and (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue working
4 through their rest breaks due to the excessive workloads, including the use of cellular phones for
5 work-related purposes.

6 28. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members premium pay
7 wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

8 29. Plaintiff and Class Members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in
9 executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were
10 required to use their personal cell phones for work-related activities such as texting or calling their
11 supervisors and clients, and using work apps such as Teams, Slack, and Paycor, for which they were
12 not reimbursed wages. Further, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to drive their personal
13 vehicles to off-location meetings, expending mileage and fuel on their personal vehicles. Plaintiff and
14 Class Members were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses.

15 30. Defendants also had a common policy and practice of unlawfully collecting and/or
16 receiving wages from Class Members. Specifically, where Plaintiff and Class Members did receive
17 any reimbursements for cell phone usage or mileage, the reimbursements were taxed.

18 31. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff
19 and Class Members the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically,
20 Plaintiff and Class Members earned commissions, spiff pay, as well as performance-based non-
21 discretionary bonuses in addition to their hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not
22 accounted for when determining Plaintiff and Class Members' sick pay wage.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

25 **(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1174, and 1198)**

26 **(Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class)**

27 32. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if
28 fully alleged herein.

1 33. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members have been
2 non-exempt employees of Defendant entitled to the full meal period protections of both the Labor
3 Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

4 34. Labor Code section 512 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare
5 Commission Wage Order impose an affirmative obligation on employers to provide non-exempt
6 employees with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period
7 of five hours, and to provide them with two uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty
8 minutes for each work period of ten hours.

9 35. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare
10 Commission Wage Order (“Wage Order”) both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work
11 during required meal periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of
12 premium wages on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required meal period.

13 36. Compensation for missed meal periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor
14 Code section 200.

15 37. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that
16 violate the applicable Wage Order.

17 38. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:

18 No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than
19 five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except
20 that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete
21 the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of
22 the employer and employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty
23 during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an
24 ‘on duty’ meal period and counted as time worked. An ‘on duty’ meal
 period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
 employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written
 agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed
 to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing,
 revoke the agreement at any time.

25 39. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was not subject to a valid on-duty meal period
26 agreement. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, **Meal Period Sub-Class**
27 members were not subject to valid on-duty meal period agreements with Defendants.

28 ///

1 40. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
2 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
3 **Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5)
4 hour work period, as required by Labor Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order.
5 Specifically, Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying **Meal Period**
6 **Sub-Class** members the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law.
7 Specifically, due to understaffing, heavy workloads, and the pre-shift duties noted above, Plaintiff
8 and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior
9 to the completion of their fifth hour of work. Furthermore, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class**
10 members were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep
11 working during meal breaks. Defendants also automatically deducted 30 minutes from Plaintiff's and
12 **Meal Period Sub-Class** members and altered their time entries accordingly in order to show
13 compliant meal periods were being taken. Lastly, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members
14 were denied first and second meal periods altogether.

15 41. Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with meal periods
16 of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not
17 scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that
18 encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised **Meal Period Sub-Class** members
19 of their meal and rest period rights; and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring **Meal Period Sub-Class**
20 members to continue working through their meal periods due to the excessive workload and the
21 automatic deduction for meal periods.

22 42. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
23 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to pay premium wages to **Meal Period Sub-**
24 **Class** members when they worked five (5) hours without clocking out for any meal period.

25 43. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
26 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
27 **Sub-Class** with a second meal period when they worked shifts of ten (10) or more hours and failed
28 to pay them premium wages as required by Labor Code 512 and the applicable Wage Order.

1 44. Moreover, Defendants written policies fail to inform Meal period Class Members of
2 their meal period rights under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

3 45. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-**
4 **Class** members additional premium wages, and/or were not paid premium wages at the employees'
5 regular rates of pay when required meal periods were not provided.

6 46. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6, 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff, on behalf of
7 himself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest
8 thereon, and costs of suit.

9 47. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
10 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the
11 **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS**

14 **(Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198)**

15 **(Plaintiff and Rest Period Sub-Class)**

16 48. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
17 herein.

18 49. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class** members have been
19 non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full rest period protections of both the Labor
20 Code and the applicable Wage Order.

21 50. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order imposes an affirmative obligation on
22 employers to permit and authorize employees to take required rest periods at a rate of no less than ten
23 (10) minutes of net rest time for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, that must
24 be in the middle of each work period insofar as practicable.

25 51. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order both prohibit
26 employers from requiring employees to work during required rest periods and require employers to
27 pay non-exempt employees an hour of premium wages at the employees' regular rates of pay, on each
28 workday that the employee is not provided with the required rest period(s).

1 52. Compensation for missed rest periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor
2 Code section 200.

3 53. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that
4 violate the Wage Order.

5 54. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
6 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing members of the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
7 with net rest period of at least ten (10) uninterrupted minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or
8 major fraction thereof, as required by the applicable Wage Order.

9 55. Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with rest periods of
10 at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1)
11 Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second
12 rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that
13 encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised **Rest Period Sub-Class**
14 members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring **Rest Period**
15 **Sub-Class** members to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload,
16 including maintaining and monitoring their cellular phones during breaks.

17 56. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
18 members additional premium wages when required rest periods were not provided.

19 57. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself
20 and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and
21 costs of suit.

22 58. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
23 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Rest**
24 **Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES**

3 **(Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1197 and 1198)**

4 **(Plaintiff and Hourly Employee Class)**

5 59. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
6 herein.

7 60. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members are or have been
8 non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full protections of the Labor Code and the
9 applicable Wage Order.

10 61. Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order defines “hours worked” as “the time during
11 which an employee is subject to the control of the employer, and includes all the time the employee
12 is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.”

13 62. Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt
14 employees at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consist of all hours
15 that an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

16 63. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
17 employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under the applicable Wage
18 Order.

19 64. Labor Code section 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover liquidated
20 damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon in addition
21 to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon.

22 65. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less
23 than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a
24 payroll period.

25 66. Labor Code section 1197.1 provides that it is unlawful for any employer or any other
26 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent or employee of another person, to pay an
27 employee, or cause an employee to be paid, less than the applicable minimum wage.

28 ///

1 67. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ employees under
2 conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

3 68. Labor Code section 204 requires employers to pay non-exempt employees their earned
4 wages for the normal work period at least twice during each calendar month on days the employer
5 designates in advance and to pay non-exempt employees their earned wages for labor performed in
6 excess of the normal work period by no later than the next regular payday.

7 69. Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for employers to pay their employees lower
8 wages than required by contract or statute while purporting to pay them legal wages.

9 70. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order require employees
10 to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than one and one-half (1.5) times their
11 respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, all
12 hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and/or for the first eight (8) hours
13 worked on the seventh consecutive day of one workweek.

14 71. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order also require
15 employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than two (2) times their respective
16 regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for all
17 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on a seventh consecutive workday during the workweek.

18 72. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, Defendants have applied
19 centrally devised policies and practices to him and **Hourly Employee Class** members with respect to
20 working conditions and compensation arrangements.

21 73. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay hourly wages to Plaintiff and **Hourly**
22 **Employee Class** members for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime hours at
23 statutory and/or agreed rates.

24 74. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were not paid proper wages and
25 overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Defendants implemented an unlawful
26 time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours
27 recorded by Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**, and upon which their pay was based, and
28 generally did so to the detriment of the Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**, and these unlawfully

1 rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and
2 payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Plaintiff and
3 **Hourly Employee Class** members only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the
4 hours they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and
5 results, over time, to the detriment of the Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members by
6 systematically undercompensating them.

7 75. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were consistently required to perform
8 work, off-the-clock for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff
9 and **Hourly Employee Class** members to perform work during their unpaid meal periods, for which
10 they were not compensated any wages. After clocking out for the day, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
11 **Class** members were required to communicate with team members, complete scheduling as well as
12 return to the store to complete work-related duties. On the days they were not scheduled to work,
13 Defendants required Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to conduct outreach and
14 prospecting calls at neighborhood schools, off-the-clock, and even participate in conference calls
15 prior to the beginning of their shifts. Moreover, Defendants required Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
16 **Class** members to cover shifts for other **Hourly Employee Class** members prior to their own
17 regularly scheduled shifts, for which they were not paid wages. The foregoing and uncompensated
18 working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

19 76. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to
20 work in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week,
21 entitling Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to minimum and overtime wages, which
22 they were systemically denied.

23 77. Defendants also failed to Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members overtime
24 wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
25 **Class** members earned commissions, spiff pay, as well as performance-based non-discretionary
26 bonuses in addition to their hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted
27 for when determining Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members' regular rates of pay, and
28 respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

1 78. As a result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
2 members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid the
3 full amount of wages earned during each pay period during the applicable limitations period,
4 including overtime wages.

5 79. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 218.6, 223, 510, 1194 and 1194.2, Plaintiff, on
6 behalf of himself and **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid straight time and
7 overtime wages, interest thereon and costs of suit.

8 80. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
9 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and
10 **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys’ fees.

11 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO PAY PROPER SICK PAY**

13 **(Lab. Code § 246)**

14 **(Plaintiff and Sick Pay Class)**

15 81. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
16 full herein.

17 82. Labor Code Section 246 affords an employee “who works in California for 30 or
18 more days within a year from the commencement of employment [] paid sick days . . . of not less
19 than one hour per every 30 hours worked” and “no less than 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid
20 time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month
21 period.”

22 83. Additionally, Subsection (l) of Section 246 provides:

23 For the purposes of this section, an employer shall calculate paid sick leave
24 using any of the following calculations:

25 (1) Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the same
26 manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee
27 uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime
28 in that workweek.

28 84. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff

///

1 and **Sick Pay Class** Members the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law.
2 Specifically, Plaintiff and **Sick Pay Class** Members worked for Defendants for more than 30 days,
3 but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick
4 time for every 12 month period of work. Additionally, the sick pay paid to Plaintiff and **Sick Pay**
5 **Class** Members did not account for the commissions, spiff pay, as well as performance-based non-
6 discretionary bonuses, which were never factored into the rate upon which sick pay was accrued and
7 paid.

8 85. Therefore, **Sick Pay Class** Members are owed the unpaid balance of said wages
9 pursuant to the Wage order according to proof at trial, interest pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.6 and
10 1194(a), Civil Code §§ 3287 and § 3289, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and/or penalties
11 pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a).

12 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **UNLAWFUL COLLECTION OR RECEIPT OF WAGES**

14 **(Lab. Code § 221)**

15 **(Plaintiffs and Unlawful Deduction Sub-Class)**

16 86. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in full
17 herein.

18 87. Labor Code § 221 provides, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or receive
19 from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee." As
20 discussed above, Defendants unlawfully received and/or collected wages from employees.
21 Specifically, where Plaintiff and **Unlawful Deduction Sub-Class** members did receive any
22 reimbursements for cell phone usage or mileage, the reimbursements were taxed.

23 88. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that all or substantially all the
24 **Unlawful Deduction Sub-Class** are subject to Defendants' policies and practices of making the
25 unlawful deductions from their wages, as discussed herein.

26 89. Therefore, **Unlawful Deduction Sub-Class** Members are owed the unpaid balance of
27 said wages pursuant to the Wage order according to proof at trial, Interest pursuant to Labor Code §§
28 218.6 and 1194(a), Civil Code §§ 3287 and § 3289, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and/or

1 penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a).

2 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL FINAL WAGES**

4 **(Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**

5 **(Plaintiff and Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class)**

6 90. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
7 herein.

8 91. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members have
9 been entitled, upon the end of their employment with Defendants, to timely payment of all wages
10 earned and unpaid before termination or resignation.

11 92. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 201, employees who have been
12 discharged have been entitled to payment of all final wages immediately upon termination.

13 93. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 202, employees who have
14 resigned after giving at least seventy-two (72) hours' notice of resignation have been entitled to
15 payment of all final wages at the time of resignation.

16 94. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
17 limitations period, Defendants have failed to timely pay **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class**
18 members all their final wages in accordance with the Labor Code.

19 95. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
20 limitations period, Defendants have maintained a policy or practice of paying **Waiting Time**
21 **Penalties Sub-Class** members their final wages without regard to the requirements of Labor Code
22 sections 201 or 202 by failing to timely pay them all final wages.

23 96. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants' failure to
24 timely pay all final wages to him and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members has been willful
25 in that Defendants have the ability to pay final wages in accordance with Labor Code sections 201
26 and/or 202 but have intentionally adopted policies or practices that are incompatible with those
27 requirements.

28 ///

97. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 203 and 218.6, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members, seeks waiting time penalties from the dates that their final wages have first become due until paid, up to a maximum of thirty days, and interest thereon.

98. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members, seeks awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY

(Lab. Code § 2802)

(Plaintiff and Reimbursement Class)

99. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

100. Labor Code section 2802(a) states:

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

101. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were required to use their personal cell phones for work-related activities such as texting or calling their supervisors and clients, and using work apps such as Teams, Slack, and Paycor, for which they were not reimbursed wages. Further, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were required to drive their personal vehicles to off-location meetings, expending mileage and fuel on their personal vehicles. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses.

102. Accordingly, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members are entitled to restitution for all unpaid amounts due and owing to within four (4) years of the date of the filing of the Complaint and until the date of entry of judgment.

103. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members, seeks

1 interest thereon and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees and
2 costs pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

3 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

5 **(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*)**

6 **(Plaintiff and UCL Class)**

7 104. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
8 herein.

9 105. Business and Professions Code section 17200 defines "unfair competition" to include
10 any unlawful business practice.

11 106. Business and Professions Code sections 17203-17204 allow a person who has lost
12 money or property as a result of unfair competition to bring a class action in accordance with Code
13 of Civil Procedure section 382 to recover money or property that may have been acquired from
14 similarly situated persons by means of unfair competition.

15 107. California law requires employers to pay hourly, non-exempt employees for all hours
16 they are permitted or suffered to work, including hours that the employer knows or reasonable should
17 know that employees have worked.

18 108. Plaintiff and the **UCL Class** members re-allege and incorporate the FIRST, SECOND,
19 THIRD, FOURTH, FIFTH, and SIXTH causes of action herein.

20 109. Plaintiff lost money or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair competition.

21 110. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair competition.

22 111. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that by committing the Labor
23 Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203,
24 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194,
25 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2802 as well as applicable Wage Orders, which make it a misdemeanor
26 to commit the violations alleged herein.

27 112. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and practices of,
28 *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an employer to: provide non-exempt

1 employees with compliant meal and rest periods; pay for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay;
2 pay proper sick time pay; and reimburse for necessary business expenditures.

3 113. Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged in this Complaint amounts to and constitutes
4 unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*
5 Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* protects against unfair competition and allows
6 a person who has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property as a result of an unfair,
7 unlawful or fraudulent business practice to seek restitution on his own behalf and on behalf of
8 similarly situated persons in a class action proceeding.

9 114. As a result of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code during the applicable
10 limitations period, Plaintiff has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property in the form
11 of earned wages. Specifically, Plaintiff has lost money or property as a result of Defendants' conduct.

12 115. Plaintiff is informed and believes that other similarly situated persons have been
13 subject to the same unlawful policies or practices of Defendants.

14 116. Due to the unfair and unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code,
15 Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in
16 the State of California that comply with their legal obligations.

17 117. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") permits civil recovery and injunctive
18 relief for "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice," including if a practice or act
19 violates or is considered unlawful under any other state or federal law.

20 118. Accordingly, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 17203,
21 Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
22 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
23 Code and applicable Wage Orders.

24 119. Accordingly, pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200 and 17203, Plaintiff
25 requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
26 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
27 Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders; and upon a final hearing seeks
28 an order permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and

employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders.

120. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **UCL Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful and unfair business practices.

121. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

122. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **UCL Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful and unfair business practices.

123. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

124. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

125. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802.¹

126. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself

¹ Plaintiff hereby reserves the right to seek penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for Defendants' violations of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code, suffered by Aggrieved Employees, but not directly suffered by Plaintiff under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.

1 and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover civil penalties
2 pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not, be brought or
3 maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

4 127. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the
5 alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee
6 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt
7 hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of
8 Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing
9 through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as
10 “Aggrieved Employees”)

11 128. In addition, paragraph (14)(A) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provides that “[a]ll
12 working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably
13 permits the use of seats.” Paragraph 14(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provides that “[w]hen
14 employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work
15 requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the
16 work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the
17 performance of their duties.

18 129. Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees suitable seating when the nature
19 of these employees’ work reasonably permitted sitting. Defendants knew or should have known that
20 Aggrieved Employees were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit when it did not
21 interfere with the performance of their duties, and that Defendants did not provide suitable seating
22 and did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties constituting
23 violations of of Labor Code § 1198 and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged,
24 including Paragraph 14 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

25 130. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code §
26 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”)
27 and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an intent to
28 investigate.

1 131. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil
2 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7,
3 246, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, and
4 2802:

- 5 i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 213, 212, 226.7, 227.3, 246
6 1174, 1194, 1198 and 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee per
7 pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
8 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor
9 Code § 2699(f)(2));
- 10 ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty
11 (30) days' pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);
- 12 iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
13 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
14 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully
15 withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful
16 or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-
17 five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee,
18 for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation
19 was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);
- 20 iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
21 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
22 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of
23 the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation
24 that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
25 employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld
26 from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the
27 subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor
28 Code § 225.5);

- v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial citation, two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before the filing of this action, one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each employee for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);
- vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each subsequent pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code § 558);
- vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1);
- viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, the State of California, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. An order that the action be certified as a class action;
- b. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;
- c. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;
- d. Unpaid wages and overtime;
- e. Actual damages;
- f. Liquidated damages;

- g. Unreimbursed expenses;
- h. Restitution;
- i. Declaratory relief;
- j. Pre-judgment interest;
- k. Statutory penalties;
- l. Costs of suit;
- m. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- n. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 3, 2026

D.LAW, INC.



David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RODOLFO BOBADILLA, and the putative class

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all other similarly situated, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: February 3, 2026

D.LAW, INC.



David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RODOLFO BOBADILLA, and the putative class