

Justin F. Marquez (SBN 262417)
justin@wilshirelawfirm.com
Benjamin H. Haber (SBN 315664)
benjamin@wilshirelawfirm.com
Daniel J. Kramer (SBN 314625)
dkramer@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

MARTIN HERNANDEZ, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

KW CALIFORNIA, a corporation; KW
PLASTICS OF CALIFORNIA., an unknown
entity; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

FILED
KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
7/25/2023
BY Jackson, Vanesa
DEPUTY

Case No.: BCV-23-100346

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

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
5. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226);
7. Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226 and 1198.5);
8. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA (Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff MARTIN HERNANDEZ ("Plaintiff"), based upon facts that either have
2 evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for
3 further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants KW CALIFORNIA, KW
6 PLASTICS OF CALIFORNIA, and DOES 1 through 10 (hereinafter collectively referred to as
7 "Defendants") for California Labor Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from
8 Defendants' failure to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages),
9 failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay
10 final wages, failure to furnish accurate wage statements, and failure to produce requested
11 employment records.

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

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

23 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
24 establishment within the State of California, including Kern County. As such, and based upon all
25 the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are
26 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
27 ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

1 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants
2 maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

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

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

28 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the

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

///

///

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff MARTIN HERNANDEZ is a California resident who worked for Defendants in Kern County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2022 to approximately July 2022.

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

B. Defendants

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendants KW CALIFORNIA and KW PLASTICS OF CALIFORNIA are, and at all times herein mentioned, were:

- (a) Business entities qualified to do business and actually conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Kern County; and,
- (b) The former employers of Plaintiff and the current and/or former employer of the putative Class, and the current and/or former employers of the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants KW CALIFORNIA and KW PLASTICS OF CALIFORNIA suffered and permitted Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

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

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

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the other employees described in the class definitions below, and the Aggrieved Employees and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

14. Plaintiff worked for Defendants in Kern County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2022 to approximately July 2022. During Plaintiff's employment for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiff an hourly wage and classified

1 him as non-exempt from overtime. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at least five
2 days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiff regularly worked more than
3 eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

4 15. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked
5 (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with legally
6 compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods, failed to
7 timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated him employment, failed to
8 furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and failed to produce requested employment
9 records. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was typical and
10 illustrative.

11 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
12 not paying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including
13 minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid
14 at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain
15 accurate records of the hours Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

16 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff,
17 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants
18 regularly, but not always, required Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work in
19 excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-
20 free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff, the Class, and
21 the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of
22 work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff, the
23 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform
24 work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal
25 periods, or by denying Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a
26 meal period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to
27 Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

28 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize

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

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

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

226(a), the Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

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

entitled, and Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e) and injunctive relief under California Labor Code § 226(h).

21. On July 18, 2022, Plaintiff sent requests through his counsel to Defendant KW California for his personnel file, pay records, wage statements, timekeeping records, and other employment-related documents pursuant to Labor Code section 226 and 1198.5. However, Defendant KW California failed to timely produce the requested employment records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Defendant KW California has not produced any of the requested employment records for Plaintiff as of the date of this Complaint.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

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

23. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

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

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

25. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

26. Plaintiff undertook this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

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

(a) **Numerosity**: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so

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

1 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
2 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time;
3 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than forty (40) individuals
4 and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection
5 of Defendants' records.

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

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

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

- 23 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually
24 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 25 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy
26 already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 27 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of
28 the claims in the particular forum; and,

4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

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

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

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

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

- (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of:
 - 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or,
 - 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the class as a whole.

30. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff contemplates the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages for All Hours Worked)

31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

32. "Hours worked" is 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.

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

34. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum and straight time wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

35. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

36. By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiff and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff and the Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiff and the Class and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

1 37. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
2 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
3 compensation due Plaintiff and the Class.

4 38. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to
5 recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

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

12 40. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum
13 and straight time wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California
14 Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

17 41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
18 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

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

27 44. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight
28 hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as employees of

1 Defendants.

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

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

10 47. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
11 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
12 Plaintiff and the Class.

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

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

22 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

24 50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
25 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

26 51. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
27 Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the
28 start of Plaintiff's and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal

1 periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. California Labor
2 Code § 512, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide
3 unpaid meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a
4 violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work
5 during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

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

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

15 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

17 54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
18 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

19 55. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten
20 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than
21 two hours). California Labor Code § 512, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer
22 permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten minutes each for each 4-hour
23 period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the
24 employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is
25 itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of California Labor Code §
26 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under
27 any Wage Order.

28 56. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the

1 Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than four hours in a
2 workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as
3 alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take
4 these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor
5 Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

6 57. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
7 premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s),
8 plus interest thereon.

9 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time**
11 **Penalties)**

12 58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
13 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

20 60. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of many other
21 members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of
22 others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail
23 to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California
24 Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of
25 their leaving Defendants' employ.

26 61. Defendants' failure to pay those Class members who are no longer employed by
27 Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72)
28

1 hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and
2 202.

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

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

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

13 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant**
15 **Wage Records)**

16 65. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
17 paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

18 66. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
19 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement
20 in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
21 worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate
22 if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made
23 on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages
24 earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the
25 employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee
26 identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
27 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
28 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

67. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff and the Class, the failure to list the true "total hours worked by the employee," and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

68. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

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

70. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

71. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

72. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against Defendant KW California for Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records)

73. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

74. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, current and former employees have the right to inspect or receive a copy of their records pertaining to their employment, upon

1 reasonable request to their employer. Under this statute, an employer that receives a request to
2 inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former employee must comply with
3 the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date
4 of the request.

5 75. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5(a), every current and former
6 employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the
7 personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any
8 grievance concerning the employee. Under this statute, upon written request from a current or
9 former employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of those
10 personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the
11 current or former employee, or his or her representative, not later than thirty (30) calendar days
12 from the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions.
13 Failure to comply with these requests allows for a civil penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars
14 (\$750), pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1198.5(k) and 226(f).

15 76. As set forth above, Plaintiff and the Class are current and former employees of
16 Defendants.

17 77. As set forth above, Plaintiff sent written requests through his counsel to Defendant
18 KW California for his payroll records, timecards, and personnel records. However, Plaintiff has
19 not received any of his requested records as of the date of this Complaint.

20 78. Defendant KW California violated California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 by
21 failing to timely produce the required records requested by Plaintiff.

22 79. On information and belief, Defendant KW California's failure to provide Plaintiff
23 with his requested employment records is not an isolated incident but was instead consistent with
24 Defendant KW California's policy and practice that applied to Plaintiff and the Class.

25 80. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5, Plaintiff and the Class are
26 entitled to a penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750) from Defendant KW California,
27 injunctive relief in the form of compliance with sections 226 and 1198.5, and attorneys' fees and
28 costs.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

81. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

82. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

83. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

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

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

Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages

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

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

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

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

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

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

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

Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records

90. Defendant KW California's failure to produce the requested employment records in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

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

92. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

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

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

1 practices in the future.

2 95. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, has no
3 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
4 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
5 practices. As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
6 above, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and
7 will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained
8 from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

9 96. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
10 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
11 withholdings.

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

18 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act**
20 **of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

21 98. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1
22 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

25 100. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
26 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "Notwithstanding any other provision of
27 law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by
28 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions,

1 commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative,
2 be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or
3 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section
4 2699.3.”

5 101. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
6 Code § 2699.3. He gave written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to
7 Defendant of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendant violated against Plaintiff
8 and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the
9 violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee.

10 102. The LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendant’s Labor
11 Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to
12 recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor
13 Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under
14 California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

15 103. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award
16 of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved
17 Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount
18 to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies
19 permitted by law.

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

23
24 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

28 ///

Class Certification

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

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

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

As to the First Cause of Action

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

5. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

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

7. For liquidated damages;

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

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

As to the Second Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

9 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

3 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

7 31. For all actual damages, according to proof;

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

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

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

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

13 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

14 36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendant KW California
15 violated the records producing provisions of California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 and
16 applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to produce the required and requested
17 documents thereto;

18 37. For all actual damages, according to proof;

19 38. For statutory penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5;

20 ///

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

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

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

25 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

26 42. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
27 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum,
28 straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and

1 permit rest periods, failing to produce requested employment records;

2 43. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and
3 prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

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

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

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

12 As to the Ninth Cause of Action

13 48. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
14 Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and
15 overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods and pay the correct amount of meal period
16 premium wages, failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay the correct amount of rest
17 period premium wages, failing to pay all wages owed twice per month, failing to maintain
18 accurate records of hours worked and meal breaks, failing to pay all final wages to terminated
19 employees, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements.

20 49. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
21 proof;

22 50. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*, and all
23 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

24 51. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
25 California Labor Code § 2699; and

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

27 As to all Causes of Action

28 53. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

1 ///

2 ///

3 Respectfully submitted,

4 Dated: July __, 2023

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

5
6 By: _____

7 Justin F. Marquez
Benjamin H. Haber
Daniel J. Kramer

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

11
12 Dated: July __, 2023

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

13
14 By: _____

15 Justin F. Marquez
Benjamin H. Haber
Daniel J. Kramer

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit B

Justin F. Marquez (SBN 262417)
justin@wilshirelawfirm.com
Benjamin H. Haber (SBN 315664)
benjamin@wilshirelawfirm.com
Daniel J. Kramer (SBN 314625)
dkramer@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

MARTIN HERNANDEZ, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

KW CALIFORNIA, a corporation; KW
PLASTICS OF CALIFORNIA., an unknown
entity; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: BCV-23-100346

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

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
5. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226);
7. Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226 and 1198.5); and
8. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and
- 8-9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA (Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff MARTIN HERNANDEZ ("Plaintiff"), based upon facts that either have
2 evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for
3 further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants KW CALIFORNIA, KW
6 PLASTICS OF CALIFORNIA, and DOES 1 through 10 (hereinafter collectively referred to as
7 "Defendants") for California Labor Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from
8 Defendants' failure to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages),
9 failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay
10 final wages, failure to furnish accurate wage statements, and failure to produce requested
11 employment records.

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

18 2-3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
19 California Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") to recover civil penalties that are owed to
20 Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt employees by Defendants in
21 the State of California during the statute of limitations period for his PAGA claim (hereinafter
22 referred to as the "Aggrieved Employees").

23 3-4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
24 establishment within the State of California, including Kern County. As such, and based upon all
25 the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are
26 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
27 ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

1 4-5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants
2 maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

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

24 5-6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
25 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
26 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were
27 willful and deliberate.

28 6-7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the

1 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
2 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.~~

3 Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of
4 herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior."

5 ///

6 ///

7 **THE PARTIES**

8 **A. Plaintiff**

9 7.8. Plaintiff MARTIN HERNANDEZ is a California resident who worked for
10 Defendants in Kern County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from
11 approximately February 2022 to approximately July 2022.

12 8.9. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new
13 Plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v.*
14 *American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

15 **B. Defendants**

16 9.10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
17 alleges, that Defendants KW CALIFORNIA and KW PLASTICS OF CALIFORNIA are, and at
18 all times herein mentioned, were:

- 19 (a) Business entities qualified to do business and actually conducting business
20 in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Kern
21 County; and,
22 (b) The former employers of Plaintiff and the current and/or former employer
23 of the putative Class, ~~and the current and/or former employers of the~~
24 ~~Aggrieved Employees~~ because Defendants KW CALIFORNIA and KW
25 PLASTICS OF CALIFORNIA suffered and permitted Plaintiff, ~~and the~~
26 ~~Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~ to work, and/or controlled their
27 wages, hours, or working conditions.
28

1 ~~10-11.~~ Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued
2 herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names.
3 Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by
4 Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~ as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend
5 this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have
6 been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

7 ~~11-12.~~ At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
8 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,
9 and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~
10 in the State of California.

11 ~~12-13.~~ Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times
12 each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and
13 the other employees described in the class definitions below, ~~and the Aggrieved Employees~~ and
14 exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and
15 believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent,
16 partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent
17 corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other
18 Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for
19 profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable
20 for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes
21 and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the
22 relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and
23 authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other
24 Defendants.

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

26 ~~13-14.~~ Plaintiff worked for Defendants in Kern County, California as an hourly-paid,
27 non-exempt employee from approximately February 2022 to approximately July 2022. During
28 Plaintiff's employment for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiff an hourly wage and classified

1 him as non-exempt from overtime. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at least five
2 days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiff regularly worked more than
3 eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

4 ~~14.15.~~ Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked
5 (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with legally
6 compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods, failed to
7 timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated him employment, failed to
8 furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and failed to produce requested employment
9 records. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was typical and
10 illustrative.

11 ~~15.16.~~ Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
12 not paying Plaintiff, and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked,
13 including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Some of this unpaid work should have
14 been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to
15 maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff, and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
16 worked.

17 ~~16.17.~~ Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff,
18 and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants
19 regularly, but not always, required Plaintiff, t-and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to
20 work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and
21 duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff, and the
22 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the
23 fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over
24 Plaintiff, and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging
25 them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking
26 mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff, t-and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
27 permission to take a meal period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was not to
28

1 provide meal periods to Plaintiff, ~~t~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance
2 with California law.

3 ~~17.18.~~ Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
4 and permit Plaintiff, ~~f~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest
5 periods. Defendants regularly required Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~ to
6 work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting
7 them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or
8 major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the~~
9 Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants
10 continued to assert control over Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~ by
11 requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed
12 without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Plaintiff, ~~and the Class,~~
13 and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy
14 and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved~~
15 Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

16 ~~18.19.~~ Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
17 pay Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~ all final wages due at their termination
18 of employment. In addition, Plaintiff's final paychecks did not include payment for all
19 ~~expenditures,~~ minimum wages, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium
20 wages, and rest period premium wages owed to him by Defendants at the conclusion of his
21 employment. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to timely pay Plaintiff's final wages
22 when his employment terminated was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead consistent
23 with Defendants' policy and practice that applied to Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved~~
24 Employees.

25 ~~19.20.~~ Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff, ~~and the~~
26 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all
27 applicable hourly rates, all overtime hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including
28 correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with

1 California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take
2 in accordance with California law). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code §
3 226(a), the Plaintiff, and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because,
4 among other things:

- 5 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
6 minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period
7 premium wages, even though they were entitled;
- 8 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
9 straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium
10 wages, even though they had not been;
- 11 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid
12 *minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period*
13 *premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were*
14 *entitled;*
- 15 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, straight
16 time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at
17 the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- 18 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
19 straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium
20 wages owed to them;
- 21 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
22 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
23 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
24 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
25 statements contained the required accurate information;
- 26 (g) by understating the wages truly due to them, the violations caused them to
27 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,
28 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;

(h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wage rates to which Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~ were entitled, and Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~ were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiff, ~~and the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees~~ are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e) and injunctive relief under California Labor Code § 226(h).

~~20-21.~~ On July 18, 2022, Plaintiff sent requests through his counsel to Defendant KW California for his personnel file, pay records, wage statements, timekeeping records, and other employment-related documents pursuant to Labor Code section 226 and 1198.5. However, Defendant KW California failed to timely produce the requested employment records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Defendant KW California has not produced any of the requested employment records for Plaintiff as of the date of this Complaint.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

~~24-22.~~ Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

~~22-23.~~ All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

~~23-24.~~ The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

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

~~24-25.~~ At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

~~25-26.~~ Plaintiff undertook this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

~~26-27.~~ There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is

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

readily ascertainable:

- (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be greater than forty (40) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.
- (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.
- (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.
- (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:
 - 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
 - 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;

1 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of
2 the claims in the particular forum; and,

3 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a
4 class action.

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

15 27-28. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if
16 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without
17 limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- 18 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum,
19 straight time, and overtime wages;
20 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to
21 Class Members;
22 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
23 wages to Class Members;
24 (d) Failed to provide Class Members with timely final wages;
25 (e) Failed to provide Class Members with accurate wage statements;
26 (f) Failed to produce requested employment records to Class Members; and,
27 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a
28 result of their illegal conduct as described above.

1 ~~28.29.~~ This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
2 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- 3 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
4 question affecting only individual members;
- 5 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
6 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 7 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
8 members of the class before the Court;
- 9 (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
10 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
11 class action;
- 12 (e) *There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and*
13 *equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate*
14 *compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are*
15 *responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members*
16 *of the Class for the injuries sustained;*
- 17 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by
18 individual members of the class would create a risk of:
- 19 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
20 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
21 of conduct for Defendants; and/or,
- 22 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
23 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other
24 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially
25 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but
26 not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from
27 those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 28 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to

1 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
2 the class as a whole.

3 ~~29-30.~~ Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
4 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own
5 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the
6 contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff
7 contemplates the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as
8 published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by
9 other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages for**
12 **All Hours Worked)**

13 ~~30-31.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
14 paragraphs 1 through ~~20-21~~ in this Complaint.

15 ~~31-32.~~ "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of
16 an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or
17 not required to do so.

18 ~~32-33.~~ At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to
19 Plaintiff and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay
20 compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the
21 provisions of California Labor Code § 1194, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which
22 require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

23 ~~33-34.~~ Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum and straight
24 time wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

25 ~~34-35.~~ By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff and the Class have been
26 deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

27 ~~35-36.~~ By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to
28 Plaintiff and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff and the Class

1 suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to
2 Plaintiff and the Class and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

3 ~~36-37.~~ By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
4 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
5 compensation due Plaintiff and the Class.

6 ~~37-38.~~ Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to
7 recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

8 ~~38-39.~~ California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all
9 wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to
10 this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates
11 required by law, including minimum and straight time wages. However, during all such times,
12 Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class all such wages due
13 and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

14 ~~39-40.~~ Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum
15 and straight time wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California
16 Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

17 ##

18 ##

19 ##

20 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

22 ~~40-41.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
23 paragraphs 1 through ~~20-21~~ in this Complaint.

24 ~~41-42.~~ California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
25 employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they
26 receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

27 ~~42-43.~~ California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California
28 shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional

1 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
2 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed
3 by the IWC is unlawful.

4 43-44. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight
5 hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as employees of
6 Defendants.

7 44-45. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class
8 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
9 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198.

10 45-46. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
11 compensation to the Plaintiff and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiff and the
12 Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently
13 unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be
14 ascertained according to proof at trial.

15 46-47. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
16 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
17 Plaintiff and the Class.

18 47-48. Plaintiff and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation according
19 to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a), as well
20 as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the
21 California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

22 48-49. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all
23 wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall
24 pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all
25 overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class
26 with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

27 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

28 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

1 ~~49-50.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
2 paragraphs 1 through ~~20-21~~ in this Complaint.

3 ~~50-51.~~ Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
4 Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the
5 start of Plaintiff's and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal
6 periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. California Labor
7 Code § 512, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide
8 unpaid meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a
9 violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work
10 during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

11 ~~51-52.~~ Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff
12 and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit
13 and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact
14 that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),
15 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable
16 Wage Orders.

17 ~~52-53.~~ Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
18 additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s),
19 plus interest thereon.

20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

22 ~~53-54.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
23 paragraphs 1 through ~~20-21~~ in this Complaint.

24 ~~54-55.~~ Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten
25 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than
26 two hours). California Labor Code § 512, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer
27 permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten minutes each for each 4-hour
28 period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the

1 employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is
2 itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of California Labor Code §
3 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under
4 any Wage Order.

5 ~~55-56.~~ Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the
6 Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than four hours in a
7 workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as
8 alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take
9 these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor
10 Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

11 ~~56-57.~~ Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
12 premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s),
13 plus interest thereon.

14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

17 ~~57-58.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
18 paragraphs 1 through ~~20-21~~ in this Complaint.

19 ~~58-59.~~ At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
20 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
21 due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment,
22 his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter,
23 unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to
24 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

25 ~~59-60.~~ Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of many other
26 members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of
27 others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail
28 to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California

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

3 ~~60-61.~~ Defendants' failure to pay those Class members who are no longer employed by
4 Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72)
5 hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and
6 202.

7 ~~61-62.~~ California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
8 wages owed, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue
9 as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is
10 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

11 ~~62-63.~~ The Class is entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages
12 for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days
13 maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

14 ~~63-64.~~ Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, the Class is also
15 entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this
16 action.

17 ##

18 ##

19 ##

20 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant**
22 **Wage Records)**

23 ~~64-65.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
24 paragraphs 1 through ~~20-21~~ in this Complaint.

25 ~~65-66.~~ At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
26 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement
27 in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
28 worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate

1 if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made
2 on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages
3 earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the
4 employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee
5 identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
6 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
7 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

8 66-67. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
9 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the
10 failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff and the Class, the failure to list
11 the true "total hours worked by the employee," and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

12 67-68. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff
13 and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

14 68-69. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by
15 Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied
16 both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage
17 statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

18 69-70. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and
19 time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class were also injured as
20 a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following
21 Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related
22 laws and regulations.

23 70-71. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their
24 actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), or
25 an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

26 71-72. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of
27 attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor
28 Code § 226(h).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Against Defendant KW California for Failure to Produce Requested Employment
Records)**

~~72-73.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through ~~20-21~~ in this Complaint.

~~73-74.~~ Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, current and former employees have the right to inspect or receive a copy of their records pertaining to their employment, upon reasonable request to their employer. Under this statute, an employer that receives a request to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former employee must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date of the request.

~~74-75.~~ Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5(a), every current and former employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any grievance concerning the employee. Under this statute, upon written request from a current or former employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of those personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the current or former employee, or his or her representative, not later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions. Failure to comply with these requests allows for a civil penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750), pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1198.5(k) and 226(f).

~~75-76.~~ As set forth above, Plaintiff and the Class are current and former employees of Defendants.

~~76-77.~~ As set forth above, Plaintiff sent written requests through his counsel to Defendant KW California for his payroll records, timecards, and personnel records. However, Plaintiff has not received any of his requested records as of the date of this Complaint.

~~77-78.~~ Defendant KW California violated California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 by failing to timely produce the required records requested by Plaintiff.

1 ~~78-79.~~ On information and belief, Defendant KW California's failure to provide Plaintiff
2 with his requested employment records is not an isolated incident but was instead consistent with
3 Defendant KW California's policy and practice that applied to Plaintiff and the Class.

4 ~~79-80.~~ Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5, Plaintiff and the Class are
5 entitled to a penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750) from Defendant KW California,
6 injunctive relief in the form of compliance with sections 226 and 1198.5, and attorneys' fees and
7 costs.

8 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(Against All Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200,**
10 **et seq.)**

11 ~~80-81.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
12 paragraphs 1 through ~~20-21~~ in this Complaint.

13 ~~81-82.~~ Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business
14 & Professions Code § 17201.

15 ~~82-83.~~ Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
16 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff
17 seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil
18 Procedure § 1021.5.

19 ~~83-84.~~ Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and
20 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
21 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

22 ~~84-85.~~ A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
23 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
24 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of
25 public policy; and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous,
26 and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of
27 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

1 ~~85-86.~~ Defendants' failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, and other benefits in
2 violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by
3 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

4 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

5 ~~86-87.~~ Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation
6 of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
7 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

8 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

9 ~~87-88.~~ Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
10 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or
11 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

13 ~~88-89.~~ Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
14 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
15 and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

16 **Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records**

17 ~~89-90.~~ Defendant KW California's failure to produce the requested employment records
18 in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
19 and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

20 ~~90-91.~~ By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices
21 described herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from
22 Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, and has deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly
23 situated, of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

24 ~~91-92.~~ Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
25 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

26 ~~92-93.~~ Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled
27 to, and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
28 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived, by

1 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and
2 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
3 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

4 93-94. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, is further
5 entitled to, and does, seek a declaration that the above-described business practices are unfair,
6 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,
7 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
8 practices in the future.

9 94-95. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, has no
10 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
11 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
12 practices. As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
13 above, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and
14 will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained
15 from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

16 95-96. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
17 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
18 withholdings.

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

25 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act**
27 **of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

98. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Complaint.

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

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

101. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. He gave written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendant of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendant violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee.

102. The LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendant's Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

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

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

96-

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

///

Class Certification

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

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

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

As to the First Cause of Action

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

5. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

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

7. For liquidated damages;

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

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

As to the Second Cause of Action

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

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: Left

1 overtime wages due;

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

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

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

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

8 As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

17 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

31. For all actual damages, according to proof;

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

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

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

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendant KW California violated the records producing provisions of California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to produce the required and requested documents thereto;

37. For all actual damages, according to proof;

38. For statutory penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5;

///

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

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

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

5 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

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

11 43. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and
12 prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

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

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

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

21 As to the Ninth Cause of Action

22 48. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
23 Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and
24 overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods and pay the correct amount of meal period
25 premium wages, failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay the correct amount of rest
26 period premium wages, failing to pay all wages owed twice per month, failing to maintain
27 accurate records of hours worked and meal breaks, failing to pay all final wages to terminated
28 employees, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements.

PROOF OF SERVICE

Hernandez v. KW California, et al.
BCV-100346

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, Ashley Narinyans, state that I am employed in the aforesaid County, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010. My electronic service address is anarinyans@wilshirelawfirm.com.

On July 19, 2023, I served the foregoing **JOINT STIPULATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT; [PROPOSED] ORDER**, on the interested parties by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope by following one of the methods of service as follows:

Jay L. Rosenlieb, Esq. (SBN 109737)
jlr@kleinlaw.com
Vanessa F. Chavez, Esq. (SBN 266724)
vchavez@kleinlaw.com
KLEIN, DENATALE, GOLDNER, COOPER,
ROSENLIB & KIMBALL, LLP
10000 Stockdale Highway, Suite 200
Bakersfield, CA 93311
Telephone: (661) 395-1000
Facsimile: (661) 326-0418

Attorney for Defendant KW Plastics of California

KW California
1861 Sunnyside Ct
Bakersfield, CA 93308

Defendant

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

(X) **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known email address or e-mail of record in this action.

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

3 Executed on **July 19, 2023** at Los Angeles, California.

4
5 
6 _____
7 Ashley Narinyans
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28