

1 Lilit Tunyan (SBN: 329351)
2 ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com
3 Artur Tunyan (SBN: 349174)
4 atunyan@tunyanlaw.com
5 TUNYAN LAW, APC
6 1336 Rossmoyne Avenue
7 Glendale, California 91207
8 Telephone: (323) 410-5050

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff JESUS GALVAN, as an individual
10 and on behalf of all employees similarly situated

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

13 JESUS GALVAN, as an individual and on
14 behalf of all employees similarly situated,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 WESTERN SKY DAIRY, LLC, a Limited
18 Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50,
19 inclusive,

20 Defendants.

FILED
KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
06/08/2023

BY Evans, Gricelda
DEPUTY

Case No. BCV-23-100992

**Amended as a matter of right, pursuant to
Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(c)**

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

1. Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198 (Failure to Pay All Wages);
2. Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 (Failure to Provide Meal Periods);
3. Violation of Labor Code § 226.7 (Failure to Provide Rest Periods);
4. Violation of Labor Code § 226, (Failure to Keep Accurate Itemized Wage Statements);
5. Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203 (Failure to Pay Wages Upon Termination of Employment);
6. Violation of Labor Code § 2802 (Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Expenditures);
7. Violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. (Unfair Business Practices); and
8. Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code sections 2698, et seq

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff JESUS GALVAN (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") on behalf of himself and
2 all others similarly situated, and as representative of the State of California and the Labor and
3 Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), based upon facts that either have evidentiary
4 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further
5 investigation and discovery, complains and alleges as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This is a class action brought on behalf of Plaintiff and the class he seeks to
8 represent ("Class" or "Class Members"). Class Members consist of all non-exempt, hourly-paid
9 employees currently and/or formerly employed by WESTERN SKY DAIRY, LLC in the State of
10 California during the Class Period. The term "Class Period" is defined as four (4) years prior to
11 the filing of this Complaint through the date final judgment is entered. Plaintiff reserves the right
12 to amend this Complaint to reflect a different "Class Period" or "Class" as further discovery is
13 conducted.

14 2. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the class he seeks to represent, seeks relief
15 against WESTERN SKY DAIRY, LLC ("Defendant") for Defendant's failure to pay all wages
16 due in violation of Labor Code Sections 204, 510 and 1194, including both regular and overtime
17 wages; failure to provide meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof pursuant to Labor Code
18 Sections 226.7 and 512, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and Code
19 of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11000 et seq.; failure to provide rest periods or compensation in
20 lieu thereof pursuant to Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, the applicable Industrial Welfare
21 Commission Wage Orders, and Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11000 et seq.; failure to
22 provide accurate itemized wage statements upon payment of wages pursuant to Labor Code
23 Sections 226, subdivision (a), 1174, and 1175; failure to reimburse for necessary expenditures
24 pursuant to Labor Code Section 2802; and failure to pay wages of terminated or resigned
25 employees pursuant to Labor Code Sections 201, 202, and 203.

26 3. Plaintiff seeks equitable remedies in the form of declaratory relief and injunctive
27 relief, and relief under Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. for unfair business
28 practices.

1 4. At all relevant times herein, Defendant has consistently maintained and enforced
2 against Plaintiff and Class the following unlawful practices and policies:

- 3 (a) willfully refusing to pay Plaintiff and Class for all hours worked, including
4 both regular and overtime;
5 (b) willfully refusing to permit Plaintiff and Class from taking meal periods or
6 compensation in lieu thereof;
7 (c) willfully refusing to permit Plaintiff and Class from taking rest periods or
8 compensation in lieu thereof;
9 (d) willfully refusing to furnish to Plaintiff and Class accurate itemized wage
10 statements upon payment of wages;
11 (e) willfully refusing to compensate Plaintiff and certain members of the Class
12 wages due and owing at the time of Plaintiff and Class Members'
13 employment with Defendant ended; and
14 (f) willfully refusing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class for necessary
15 expenditures.

16 5. On information and belief, Defendant was on actual and constructive notice of
17 the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies.
18 Defendant's violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and
19 deliberate.

20 6. At all relevant times, Defendant was and is legally responsible for all of the
21 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
22 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and Class. Further, Defendant is responsible
23 for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of
24 "respondeat superior".

25 7. Plaintiff further brings this action as a representative of the State of California
26 and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") to recover civil penalties
27 pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), Labor Code sections 2698, et seq.,
28

1 for violations of numerous Labor Code provisions, including, but not limited to, sections 201-
2 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, and 2802, as well as violations of the applicable
3 Wage Order.

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 8. Venue is proper in this judicial district and in the County of Kern, California
6 because Defendant maintained its location and/or transacted business in this county, the
7 obligations and liability arise in this county, and work was performed by members of the proposed
8 class made the subject of this action in this county.

9 9. The wages, statutory penalties, monetary damages and restitution sought by
10 Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established
11 according to proof at trial. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California
12 Constitution, article VI, Section 10. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify
13 any other basis for jurisdiction.

14 10. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction in the matter because the individual
15 claims are under the seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00) jurisdictional threshold for
16 Federal Court and the five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00) aggregate jurisdictional threshold for
17 Federal Court and, upon information and belief, Plaintiff and Defendant are residents of,
18 domiciled in, or otherwise subject to jurisdiction in the State of California. Further, there is no
19 federal question at issue as the issues herein are based solely on California statutes and law
20 including the Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders, the Code of
21 Civil Procedure, the Rules of Court, and the Business and Professions Code.

22 **THE PARTIES**

23 **A. Plaintiff**

24 11. Plaintiff, at all relevant times herein, was Defendant's employee and was entitled
25 to compensation for all hours worked, including regular time and overtime compensation, and
26 penalties from Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a non-exempt, hourly paid
27 employee during the Class Period. Specifically, Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a milker from
28 approximately May 2019 to March 24, 2023 at Defendant's facility located at 18501 Old River

1 Road, Bakersfield, California 93311. Each of the Class Members are identifiable, current and/or
2 former similarly situated persons who were employed in non-exempt hourly positions in
3 California by Defendant during the Class Period.

4 **B. Defendant**

5 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant is a
6 limited liability company. Defendant produces and distributes dairy products. On information and
7 belief, Defendant was and/or is the employer of Plaintiff and Class during the Class Period.
8 Plaintiff also alleges that Defendant is conducting business in good standing in California.

9 13. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships and extent of
10 participation in the conduct herein alleged of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50,
11 inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that these Defendants are legally responsible for
12 the payment of overtime compensation, rest and meal period compensation, and wages to Plaintiff
13 and Class by virtue of their unlawful practices, and therefore sues these Defendants by such
14 fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of
15 each DOE Defendants when ascertained.

16 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant
17 acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendant, carried out a joint
18 scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant
19 are legally attributable to the other Defendant. Furthermore, Defendants in all respects acted as
20 the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and Class.

21 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant
22 acted in all respects as the agent, servant, partner, joint venture, alter-ego, employee, proxy,
23 managing agent, and/or principal of the Defendant, and in performing the actions mentioned
24 below was acting, at least in part, within the course and scope of that authority as such agent,
25 proxy, servant, partner, joint venture, employee, alter-ego, managing agent, and/or principal with
26 permission and consent of the Defendant. Plaintiff also alleges the acts of each Defendant are
27 legally attributable to the other Defendant.

1 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the
2 Defendant sued herein was, at all times relevant hereto, the employer, owner, shareholder,
3 principal, joint venture, proxy, agent, employee, supervisor, representative, manager, managing
4 agent, joint employer and/or alter-ego of the remaining Defendant, and was acting, at least in part,
5 within the course and scope of such employment and agency, with the express and implied
6 permission, consent, and knowledge, approval and/or ratification of the other Defendant.

7 17. The above Defendant, managing agents, and supervisors aided, abetted, condoned,
8 permitted, approved, authorized and/or ratified the unlawful acts described herein.

9 **ADMINISTRATIVE PREREQUISITE**

10 18. On March 30, 2023, prior to filing this complaint, Plaintiff gave written notice by
11 electronically filing the notice with the Labor Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA")
12 (LWDA Case No. LWDA-945264-23) and by certified mail to Defendant of the specified
13 provisions alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
14 violations as required by Labor Code Section 2699.3.

15 19. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's letter sent to the LWDA dated March 30,
16 2023, is attached hereto as "Exhibit A". As of the filing of this complaint, LWDA has not
17 responded to the written notice.

18 20. Under Labor Code Section 2699.3 subsection (a), a plaintiff may bring a cause
19 of action under PAGA only after giving notice to the Labor Workforce Development Agency
20 ("LWDA") and the employer of the Labor Code Sections alleged to have been violated, and
21 after receiving notice from the LWDA of its intention not to investigate, or after 65 days have
22 passed without notice.

23 21. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed without notice from the LWDA.
24 Accordingly, all administrative prerequisites to filing this action have been fulfilled.

25 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

26 22. Plaintiff was employed as a milker from approximately May 2019 to March 24,
27 2023.

1 23. Labor Code Section 1194 provides that notwithstanding any agreement to work
2 for a lesser wage, an employee receiving less than the legal overtime compensation is entitled to
3 recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of his or her overtime compensation, including interest
4 thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

5 24. Labor Code Section 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages
6 two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays.
7 Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (a) labor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
8 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the
9 month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last
10 day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the
11 following month. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (d) the requirements of this Section shall
12 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
13 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.
14 Plaintiff and Class were also entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all
15 meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours
16 worked. However, during Class period, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the
17 employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were
18 not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods
19 not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked.

20 25. Further, Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that any person
21 who engages in unfair competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction.
22 Business and Professions Code Section 17204 provides that any person who has suffered actual
23 injury and has lost money or property as a result of the unfair competition may bring an action in
24 a court of competent jurisdiction.

25 26. During all, or a portion of the Class Period, Plaintiff and each member of the Class
26 was employed by Defendant in the State of California.

27 27. Plaintiff and Class Members were non-exempt employees covered under one or
28 more IWC Wage Order(s), and Labor Code Section 510, and/or other applicable Wage Orders,

1 regulations and statutes, and each Class Member was not subject to an exemption for executive,
2 administrative or professional employees, which imposed obligations on the part of Defendant to
3 pay Plaintiff and Class Members lawful overtime compensation.

4 28. Plaintiff and Class were covered by one or more IWC Wage Order(s), and Labor
5 Code Section 226.7 and other applicable Wage Orders, regulations and statutes which imposed
6 an obligation on the part of Defendant to pay Plaintiff and Class rest and meal period
7 compensation.

8 29. During the Class Period, Defendant were obligated to pay Plaintiff and Class
9 Members for all hours worked. However, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
10 for all hours worked at the legally mandated wage rates, including all overtime wages.
11 Defendant regularly used a system of time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a period of
12 time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and Class properly for all the time they have actually
13 worked, even though the realities of Defendant's operations are such that it is possible,
14 practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant
15 frequently paid Plaintiff and Class less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also
16 should have been paid at the overtime rate. Throughout the Class Period, Defendant also failed
17 to maintain accurate time records and falsified Plaintiff's and Class Members' time records.
18 Defendant maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and Class to perform work
19 "off-the-clock", but Plaintiff and Class were only required to input their scheduled start time
20 despite the fact that they would arrive earlier than their scheduled start time to perform some
21 preparatory work like turning on the machines and other preparatory work. Additionally,
22 Plaintiff and Class were required to arrive earlier than their scheduled shift start to make sure
23 they have enough time to clock in to work on time without waiting in line with other
24 employees using a single tablet in their jobsite to clock in to work. Often times, Plaintiff and
25 Class were also required to clock out for their first meal period and continue working. In
26 maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain accurate
27 records of the hours Plaintiff and Class worked.
28

1 30. During the Class Period, Defendant were obligated to pay Plaintiff and Class
2 Members overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours of work in one
3 (1) day or forty (40) hours in one (1) week and double-time compensation for hours worked in
4 excess of twelve (12) in one (1) day. However, often times Plaintiff and Class Members were
5 required to work overtime in excess of eight (8) hours per workday and in excess of forty (40)
6 hours per workweek but were not paid at the proper overtime rate of pay.

7 31. During the Class Period, Defendant were obligated to provide Plaintiff and Class
8 with a work-free meal period within the first five (5) hours of a shift when the workday was
9 longer than six (6) hours. Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to a full, thirty (30) minute,
10 off-duty meal period when they worked in excess of six (6) hours within the first five (5) hours
11 of their shifts. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and Class to work in excess of five
12 consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free
13 meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and Class for meal
14 periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work.
15 Plaintiff and Class Members were routinely not provided with timely, 30-minute off-duty meal
16 periods, and were not permitted and authorized to take uninterrupted meal periods. Defendant
17 did not adequately inform Plaintiff and Class of their right to take a meal period by the end of the
18 fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than ten (10) hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work.
19 Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods
20 for Plaintiff and Class, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the
21 timing of meal periods. Plaintiff and Class would often times miss their meal periods, have
22 interrupted or short meal periods. Plaintiff and Class would often times take their first meal
23 periods late, sometimes even after the seventh hour of work or clock out for meal period but
24 continue working since their supervisors would instruct them to take meal periods one by one to
25 make sure the work of the machines is never stopped or interrupted. In those occasions when
26 Plaintiffs and Class had an opportunity to take their first meal periods, Defendant wrongfully
27 required Plaintiffs and Class to combine their 30-minute first meal periods with their first rest
28 periods and have one 45- minute combined meal and rest break instead of taking separate meal

1 periods and separate rest periods. When Plaintiff and Class worked more than ten hours they
2 have never been authorized or taken their second meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy
3 and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and Class in compliance with
4 California law.

5 32. Additionally, Defendant were obligated to provide Plaintiff and Class Members
6 with a ten (10) minute rest break for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked each
7 day. Defendant prevented Plaintiff and Class Members from taking rest breaks throughout their
8 shifts. Plaintiff and Class Members were generally precluded from taking rest periods due to
9 Defendant's failure to maintain the rest break policy to provide relief and thereby allow Plaintiff
10 and Class Members the opportunity to take rest breaks. Moreover, Defendant did not have
11 adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and Class, nor
12 did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant
13 did not schedule rest periods every 4 hours or a major fraction. Plaintiff and Class were instructed
14 to make sure the work of the machines is not stopped or interrupted. Defendant wrongfully
15 required Plaintiff and Class to take only one rest period during their shift, to combine their 30-
16 minute first meal periods with their first rest periods and to take combined one 45-minute first
17 meal and rest break instead of taking separate meal periods and separate rest periods. Plaintiff and
18 Class have never been authorized and taken their second and third rest periods when they worked
19 shifts of eight hours or longer. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and
20 Class to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

21 33. Further, due to the pressure from Defendant and failure to maintain an adequate
22 policy, and in violation of Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff was not
23 authorized and permitted to take a second rest period, on shifts exceeding six hours of work,
24 and/or third rest breaks, on shifts exceeding ten hours of work. *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
25 *Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1030 (2012). "Employees are entitled to 10 minutes rest for
26 shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six hours
27 up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on."

1 34. Furthermore, Defendant failed and/or refused to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
2 one (1) hour's pay at the employees' regular rate of pay as premium compensation for Defendant's
3 failure to provide lawful thirty (30) minute, off-duty meal periods and failure to provide lawful
4 ten (10) minute rest periods within the statutory time frames.

5 35. Defendant also failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members all necessary
6 expenditures incurred in direct discharge of their duties. During the Class Period, Defendant
7 required Plaintiff and Class to use their personal cell phones for work to communicate with
8 supervisors regarding the work assignments. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class for
9 personal cell phone usage. Additionally, Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class for the
10 masks they were required to purchase when COVID pandemic started. Plaintiff and Class incurred
11 these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and
12 Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class for these employment-related expenses.

13 36. Defendant continues to employ non-exempt, hourly-paid employees within
14 California.

15 37. Plaintiff and Class Members primarily performed non-exempt work, often in
16 excess of the maximum regular rate hours set forth in the applicable IWC Wage Order(s),
17 regulations or statutes, and therefore entitled the Plaintiff and Class Members to overtime
18 compensation at the rate of one and a half times their regular rate of pay and, when applicable,
19 double time compensation as set forth by the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), regulations and/or
20 statutes.

21 38. During the Class Period, Defendant required Plaintiff and Class Members to work
22 regular hours, off the clock hours, and overtime hours without lawful compensation in violation
23 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), regulations and statutes, and Defendant: (1) willfully failed
24 and refused, and continue to fail and refuse to pay compensation for all hours worked, including
25 lawful regular time and overtime compensation, to Class Members; and (2) willfully failed and
26 refused, and continue to fail and refuse to pay due and owing wages promptly upon termination
27 of employment to Plaintiff and affected Class Members.

1 39. Class Members who ended their employment with Defendant during the Class
2 Period but were not paid the above due compensation for all hours worked timely upon the
3 termination of their employment as required by Labor Code Sections 201, 202, and 203 are
4 entitled to penalties as provided by Labor Code Section 203.

5 40. During the Class Period, Defendant failed to furnish Plaintiff and Class with
6 accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net
7 wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked, correct
8 overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance
9 with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to
10 take in accordance with California law). As a result of these violations of California Labor
11 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and Class suffered injury because, among other things:

- 12 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
13 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
14 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
15 entitled;
- 16 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
17 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
18 though they had not been;
- 19 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid overtime,
20 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
21 California rate even though they were;
- 22 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid overtime, meal period
23 premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even
24 though they had not been;
- 25 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of overtime,
26 meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 27
- 28

1 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
2 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
3 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
4 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
5 statements contained the required accurate information;

6 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
7 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability,
8 unemployment, and other governmental benefits;

9 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
10 rates to which Plaintiff and Class were entitled, and Plaintiff and Class were
11 paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.
12

13 Thus, Plaintiff and Class are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code §
14 226(e), including actual damages.

15 41. During the Class period, Defendant failed to maintain accurate time records.
16 Plaintiff and Class were only required to input their scheduled start time versus actual time,
17 Plaintiff's and Class Members' time was wrongfully rounded. Plaintiff and Class were also
18 required to record their first meal period time regardless of whether it was actually taken or not.
19 Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods
20 taken or missed by Plaintiff and Class. Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records
21 required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and Class the ability to know,
22 understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their
23 hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and Class had no way to dispute
24 the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to
25 Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and Class have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial
26 losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses
27 and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law,
28 all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's

1 knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and
2 Class have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and
3 disputing the wage payments paid to them.

4 42. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class members were
5 entitled to receive accurate wage statements, which would include meal break premiums, and/or
6 rest break premiums, as required by Labor Code 226.

7 43. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were
8 entitled to timely payment of all wages earned upon termination. Plaintiff and Class Members did
9 not receive payment of all wages, including but not limited to, meal and rest break premiums, in
10 violation of the Labor Code.

11
12 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

13 44. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated
14 persons as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 382. The Class is composed
15 of and defined as follows:

- 16 (a) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
17 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
18 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and were not
19 paid all wages owed, including but not limited to the legally requisite regular
20 time rate, overtime rate and/or double-time rate as specifically described
21 herein;
- 22 (b) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
23 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
24 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not
25 been provided a meal period for shifts in excess of five (5) hours within the
26 first five (5) hours such shifts, and were not provided one (1) hour's pay for
27 each day during which a lawful meal period was not provided;
- 28

- 1 (c) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
2 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
3 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not
4 been provided a rest period for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof,
5 worked per day, and were not provided compensation of one (1) hour's pay for
6 each day on which such rest period(s) was not provided;
- 7 (d) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
8 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
9 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not
10 been reimbursed expenditures in discharge of their duties;
- 11 (e) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
12 State of California, and who, within the three (3) years of the filing of this
13 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have
14 been terminated or resigned, and have not been paid wages pursuant to Labor
15 Code Section 203 and are owed restitution and waiting time penalties for
16 unpaid wages;
- 17 (f) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
18 State of California, and who, within the one (1) year of the filing of this
19 Complaint to the present have worked as non-exempt employees and were not
20 provided an accurate payroll record or wage statement as required under Labor
21 Code Sections 226 and 1174;
- 22 (g) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
23 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
24 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and were
25 subjected to unlawful and unfair business practices within the meaning of
26 California's Unfair Competition Law and who suffered injury, including lost
27 money, as a result of Defendant's unlawful and unfair business practices.
28

1 45. Throughout discovery in this litigation, Plaintiff may find it appropriate and/or
2 necessary to amend the definition of the Class. Plaintiff will formally define and designate a class
3 definition at such time when Plaintiff seeks to certify the Class alleged in this Complaint.

4 46. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to
5 Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because there is a well-defined common interest of many
6 persons and it is impractical to bring them all before the court.

7 47. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
8 Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because:

- 9 (a) The questions of law and fact common to Class predominate over any
10 question affecting only individual class members;
- 11 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
12 efficient adjudication of the claims of the Class members;
- 13 (c) Class is so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the
14 Class before the Court;
- 15 (d) Plaintiff and Class Members will not be able to obtain effective and
16 economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- 17 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
18 equitable relief for the common law and statutory violations and other
19 improprieties and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages
20 and injuries which Defendant's actions have inflicted upon Class;
- 21 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets and
22 available insurance of the Defendant are sufficient to adequately
23 compensate Class Members for the injuries sustained;
- 24 (g) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by
25 individual members of the Class would create a risk of:
 - 26 (1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
27 members of the Class which would establish an incompatible
28 standard of conduct for Defendant; and/or

- 1 (2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which
2 would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other
3 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially
4 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including
5 but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available
6 from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendant; and
7 (h) Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
8 Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
9 Class as a whole.

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

- 12 (a) Numerosity: The members of Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
13 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
14 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
15 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 150 individuals and the
16 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
17 Defendant's records.
18 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the
19 interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined
20 community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical
21 of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.
22 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
23 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
24 defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated
25 herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class
26 Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the
27 rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.
28

1 Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will
2 continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be
3 necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
4 benefit of each class member.

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

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

16
17 (e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is
18 to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a
19 class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights
20 out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also
21 fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers
22 might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or
23 other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in
24 the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of
25 their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

26 49. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
27 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. Defendant's own
28

1 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the
2 contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would
3 contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as
4 published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by
5 other methods suitable to Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure to Pay All Wages for All Hours Worked**

8 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

9 50. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding
10 paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

11 51. Labor Code Section 510, subdivision (a) states in pertinent part: "Any work in
12 excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek...
13 shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for
14 any employee."

15 52. Labor Code Section 1194, subdivision (a) states: "Notwithstanding any agreement
16 to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
17 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the
18 unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including
19 interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit."

20 53. Further, pursuant to Labor Code Section 1197, payment of less than the minimum
21 wage fixed by the Labor Commission is unlawful.

22 54. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer
23 than the hours set by the Industrial Welfare Commission or under conditions prohibited by the
24 IWC Wage Order(s).

25 55. Pursuant to the IWC Wage Order(s), Defendant is required to pay Plaintiff and
26 Class Members for all hours worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to
27 the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work,
28 whether or not required to do so.

1 56. During the Class Period, Defendant was obligated to pay Plaintiff and Class
2 Members for all hours worked. However, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
3 for all hours worked at the legally mandated wage rates, including all overtime wages. Defendant
4 regularly used a system of time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a period of time, in
5 failing to compensate Plaintiff and Class properly for all the time they have actually worked,
6 even though the realities of Defendant's operations are such that it is possible, practical, and
7 feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid
8 Plaintiff and Class less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been
9 paid at the overtime rate. Throughout the Class Period, Defendant also failed to maintain
10 accurate time records and falsified Plaintiff's and Class Members' time records. Defendant
11 maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and Class to perform work "off-the-
12 clock", but Plaintiff and Class were only required to input their scheduled start time despite the
13 fact that they would arrive earlier than their scheduled start time to perform some preparatory
14 work like turning on the machines and other preparatory work. Additionally, Plaintiff and Class
15 were required to arrive earlier than their scheduled shift start to make sure they have enough time
16 to clock in to work on time without waiting in line with other employees using a single tablet in
17 their jobsite to clock in to work. Often times, Plaintiff and Class were also required to clock out
18 for their first meal period and continue working. In maintaining a practice of not paying all
19 wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and Class
20 worked.

21 57. Plaintiff and Class Members were required to work overtime in excess of eight (8)
22 hours per workday and in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek, but were not paid at the proper
23 overtime rate of pay.

24 58. Labor Code Section 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages
25 two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays.
26 Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (a) labor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
27 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the
28 month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last

1 day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the
2 following month. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (d) the requirements of this Section shall
3 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
4 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.
5 Plaintiff and Class were also entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all
6 meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours
7 worked. However, during Class period, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the
8 employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were
9 not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods
10 not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked.

11 59. Defendant's pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy
12 regarding illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an
13 entitlement, pursuant to Labor Code Section 218, to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the
14 Class, in a civil action, of the unpaid balance of the full amount of wages owing, calculated at the
15 appropriate rate.

16 60. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194.2(a) (which provides that in any action under
17 Labor Code § 1194, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages), the members
18 of Class seek recovery of liquidated damages on the straight-time portion of uncompensated hours
19 of work (not including the overtime portion thereof) in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
20 unpaid and interest thereon.

21 61. That calculation of individual damages for Class Members may at some point be
22 required does not foreclose the possibility of taking common evidence on questions regarding
23 their entitlement to overtime compensation. *Collins v. Rocha* (1972) 7 Cal.3d 232; *Hypolite v.*
24 *Carleson* (1975) 52 Cal.App.3d 566; *Employment Development Dept. v. Superior Court* (1981)
25 30 Cal.3d 256).

26 62. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 218.6 and 1194(a) and Civil Code Section 3287,
27 Class Members seek recovery of pre-judgment interest on all amounts recovered herein.
28

1 63. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 218.5 and/or 1194, Class Members request that
2 the Court award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred by them in this action.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof**

5 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

6 64. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding
7 paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

8 65. Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512 provide that no employer shall employ any
9 person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without providing a meal period of not less
10 than thirty (30) minutes within the fifth (5th) hour of work or employ any person for a work period
11 of more than ten (10) hours without a second (2nd) meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

12 66. Labor Code Section 226.7 provides that if an employer fails to provide an
13 employee a meal period in accordance with this Section, the employer shall pay the employee one
14 (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal
15 period is not provided in accordance with this Section.

16 67. Defendant failed to schedule Plaintiff and Class Members in a manner as to
17 reasonably ensure that Plaintiff and Class Members could take such meal periods within the
18 statutory timeframe. As a result, Plaintiff and Class were often forced to forego their meal
19 periods, work during their meal periods and/or take meal periods after the fifth (5th) hour of their
20 shifts. In so doing, Defendant has intentionally and improperly denied meal periods to Plaintiff
21 and Class Members in violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, and other regulations and
22 statutes.

23 68. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and Class have worked more than five (5)
24 hours in a workday.

25 69. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant failed to schedule Plaintiff and Class
26 Members in a manner so as to reasonably provide work-free meal periods in accordance with
27 Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.
28

1 70. By virtue of Defendant's failure to schedule Plaintiff and Class Members in such
2 a way as to provide a timely and/or work free meal period to Plaintiff and Class Members, Plaintiff
3 and Class Members have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in an amount which is
4 presently unknown, but which exceed the jurisdictional limits of this Court and which will be
5 ascertained according to proof at trial.

6 71. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of Class Members, requests recovery of meal
7 period compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7 for the four (4) years prior to filing
8 this complaint, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendant in a sum as
9 provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Failure to Provide Rest Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof**

12 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

13 72. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding
14 paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

15 73. The IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code Section 226.7 provides that employers
16 must authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods at the rate of ten (10) minutes rest
17 time per four (4) work hours or major fraction thereof.

18 74. Labor Code Section 226.7, subdivision (b) provides that if an employer fails to
19 provide an employee rest period in accordance with this Section, the employer shall pay the
20 employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday
21 that the rest period is not provided.

22 75. During the Class Period, Defendant did not provide Plaintiff and Class Members
23 with a ten-minute rest period for every four (4) work hours or major fraction thereof. Therefore,
24 Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided lawful rest periods.

25 76. Defendant failed and/or refused to implement a policy by which Plaintiff and Class
26 Members could receive rest periods and/or work free rest periods. By and through its actions,
27 Defendant intentionally and improperly denied rest periods to Plaintiff and Class Members in
28 violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.

1 77. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and Class have worked more than four (4)
2 hours in a workday.

3 78. By virtue of the Defendant's unlawful failure to provide rest periods to Plaintiff
4 and Class Members, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered, and will continue to suffer,
5 damages, in amounts which are presently unknown, but which exceed the jurisdictional limits of
6 this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

7 79. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of employees similarly situated, requests
8 recovery of rest period compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7 for the four (4) years
9 prior to filing this Complaint, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against
10 Defendant, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or any other statute.

11 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

13 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

14 80. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs
15 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

16 81. Labor Code Section 1174, subdivision (d) requires an employer to keep at a central
17 location in California, or at the plant or establishment at which the employee is employed, payroll
18 records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, each employee.

19 82. Throughout the Class Period, Defendant failed to maintain accurate time records.
20 Plaintiff and Class were only required to input their scheduled start time versus actual time,
21 Plaintiff's and Class Members' time was wrongfully rounded. Plaintiff and Class were also
22 required to record their first meal period time regardless of whether it was actually taken or not.

23 83. Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code
24 IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and Class the ability to know, understand and question the
25 accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in
26 Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and Class had no way to dispute the resulting failure to
27 pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct
28 result, Plaintiff and Class have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the

use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

84. Labor Code Section 226, subdivision (a) requires an employer to provide employees—either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal check or cash—an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing

(1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee . . . , (4) all deductions . . . , (5) net wages, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer . . . , and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee

85. Moreover, the IWC Wage Orders require that every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee, including time records showing when each employee begins and ends each work period, the total daily hours worked by each employee and the total hours worked in each payroll period, and applicable rates of pay.

86. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant willfully and intentionally failed to make and/or keep records which accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and Class. Specifically, Plaintiff believes that Defendant's records do not accurately reflect when Plaintiff and Class worked during their meal and rest periods and/or took untimely meal periods or worked for hours not paid.

87. Labor Code Section 226, subdivision (e) provides that if an employer knowingly

1 and intentionally fails to provide a statement itemizing, inter alia, the gross and net wages earned,
2 the total hours worked by the employee and the applicable hourly overtime rates, causing the
3 employee injury, then the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or
4 fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial violation and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each
5 subsequent violation, up to four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00). Plaintiff is informed and believes
6 that Defendant willfully failed to make or keep accurate records for Plaintiff and Class.

7 88. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant's failure to keep accurate payroll
8 records, as described above, violated Labor Code Section 1174, subdivision (d) and Section 226,
9 subdivision (a), and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s). Pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699,
10 subdivision (f)(2), Plaintiff and Class are entitled to penalties of \$100.00 and for the initial
11 violation and \$200.00 for each subsequent violation for every pay period during which these
12 records and information were not kept by Defendant.

13 89. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant's failure to keep and maintain
14 accurate records and information, as described above, was willful, and Plaintiff and Class are
15 entitled to statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 1174.5.

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure to Pay Wages upon Termination of Employment**

18 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

19 90. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs
20 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

21 91. Plaintiff's employment with Defendant ended on or about February 22, 2023.
22 Plaintiff and certain Class who ended their employment with Defendant during the Class Period,
23 were entitled to be promptly paid for all hours worked, including lawful regular time
24 compensation, overtime compensation, double-time compensation, and other premiums, as
25 required by Labor Code Sections 201 through 203. Plaintiff is also entitled to meal period and
26 rest period premium pay in accordance with Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.7.

27 92. Plaintiff and Class were not compensated for their unlawful and/or missed meal
28 periods and/or rest periods, and were not paid proper regular time compensation, overtime

1 compensation or double-time compensation in accordance with law as a result of Defendant's
2 illegal rounding practice.

3 93. To date, Plaintiff and Class Members who ended their employment with
4 Defendant during the Class Period have not been compensated for all hours worked.

5 94. Plaintiff and the affected Class Members seek the payment of penalties pursuant
6 to Labor Code Section 203, according to proof.

7 95. Plaintiff is also entitled to attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to Labor Code
8 Section 1194, and prejudgment interest.

9 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures**

11 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

12 96. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all the above paragraphs
13 of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

14 97. California Labor Code §2802, states "An employer shall indemnify his or her
15 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence
16 of the discharge of his or her duties."

17 98. Plaintiff and Class were not reimbursed by Defendant for necessary expenditures
18 as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties. Specifically, during the Class Period,
19 Defendant required Plaintiff and Class to use their personal cell phones for work to communicate
20 with supervisors regarding the work assignments. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and
21 Class for personal cell phone usage. Additionally, Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and
22 Class for the masks they were required to purchase when COVID pandemic started. Plaintiff and
23 Class incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for
24 Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class for these employment-
25 related expenses.

26 99. Defendant knowingly, willingly and intentionally attempted to offset the cost of
27 doing business on the Plaintiff and Class.

28 100. Defendant had a corporate practice and policy of requiring Plaintiff and Class to

1 shoulder the burden of Defendant's cost of doing business by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and
2 Class for necessary expenditures, specifically requiring Plaintiff and Class to use their personal
3 cell phones, vehicles for work and to purchase tools.

4 101. Accordingly, Plaintiff and Class are entitled to an award of "necessary
5 expenditures or losses" shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorney's
6 fees and interest.

7 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Unfair Business Practices**

9 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

10 102. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs
11 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

12 103. Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. (also referred to herein as
13 the "Unfair Business Practices Act" or "Unfair Competition Law") prohibits unfair competition
14 in the form of any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.

15 104. Business and Professions Code Section 17204 allows "a person who has suffered
16 injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of the unfair competition" to prosecute a
17 civil action for violation of the Unfair Competition Law ("UCI").

18 105. Labor Code Section 90.5, subdivision (a) states that it is the public policy of
19 California to vigorously enforce minimum labor standards in order to ensure employees are not
20 required to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect employers who
21 comply with the law from those who attempt to gain competitive advantage at the expense of their
22 workers by failing to comply with minimum labor standards.

23 106. Beginning at an exact date unknown to Plaintiff, but at least since the date four (4)
24 years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, Defendant has committed acts of unfair competition as
25 defined by the Unfair Business Practices Act, by engaging in the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent
26 business practices and acts described in this Complaint including but not limited to violations of
27 Labor Code Sections 201-204, 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, 2699(f)(2) as well as other
28 statutes.

1 107. The violations of these laws and regulations, as well as of the fundamental
2 California public policies protecting workers, serve as unlawful predicate acts and practices for
3 purposes of Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq.

4 108. The acts and practices described above constitute unfair, unlawful and fraudulent
5 business practices, and unfair competition, within the meaning of Business and Professions Code
6 Section 17200 et seq. Among other things, the acts and practices have forced Plaintiff and other
7 similarly situated employees to labor for many consecutive hours without receiving the meal and
8 rest periods and overtime compensation to which they are entitled by law, while enabling
9 Defendant to gain an unfair competitive advantage over law-abiding employers and competitors.

10 109. As a result of Defendant's acts, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury
11 in fact in being denied their statutorily entitled meal and rest periods and full compensation for
12 hours worked.

13 110. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts and practices, Plaintiff
14 and Class have suffered lost wages in an amount to be proven at trial.

15 111. Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that a court may make
16 such orders or judgments as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by any person
17 of any practice which constitutes unfair competition. Injunctive relief is necessary and
18 appropriate to prevent Defendant from repeating its unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts
19 and business practices alleged above.

20 112. Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that the Court may restore
21 to any person in interest any money or property that may have been acquired by means of such
22 unfair competition. Plaintiff and Class are entitled to restitution pursuant to Business and
23 Professions Code Section 17203 for all wages and payments unlawfully withheld from
24 employees, including the fair value of the meal and rest periods taken away from them during the
25 four-year period prior to the filing of this Complaint, as well as for all expenses or losses incurred
26 by Plaintiff and Class in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her
27 obedience to the directions of the employer.

1 113. Business and Professions Code Section 17202 provides, "Notwithstanding Section
2 3369 of the Civil Code, specific or preventative relief may be granted to enforce a penalty,
3 forfeiture, or penal law in a case of unfair competition." Plaintiff and Class are entitled to enforce
4 all applicable penalty provisions of the Labor Code pursuant to Business and Professions Code
5 Section 17202.

6 114. Plaintiff's success in this action will enforce important rights affecting public
7 interest, and in that regard, Plaintiff sues on behalf of the general public, as well as herself and
8 other similarly situated employees. Plaintiff and Class seek and are entitled to restitution, civil
9 penalties, declaratory and injunctive relief, and all other equitable remedies owing them.

10 115. Plaintiff herein takes upon himself enforcement of these laws and lawful claims.
11 There is a financial burden involved in pursuing this action. The action is seeking to vindicate a
12 public right, and it would be against the interests of justice to penalize Plaintiff by forcing her to
13 pay attorneys' fees from the recovery in this action. Attorneys' fees are appropriate pursuant to
14 Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 and otherwise.

15 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Violation of California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.***

17 **(Against Defendants, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

18 116. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs herein,
19 as if fully alleged herein.

20 117. Plaintiff seeks recovery of penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorney
21 General Act of 2004 ("PAGA.") (Labor Code sections 2698 *et seq.*)

22 118. PAGA permits an "aggrieved employee" to recover penalties on behalf of
23 himself/herself and other employees subject to violations of the Labor Code, including violations
24 of sections 201-204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, and 2802, as well as the applicable Wage
25 Order.

26 119. Plaintiff is informed and believes Defendants at all relevant times employed one
27 or more employees.

28 120. For those code sections that provide for the recovery of civil penalties, Plaintiff

1 will seek on behalf of all aggrieved employees those penalties. For those sections of the Labor
2 Code that do not specifically provide for civil penalties, Plaintiff will seek civil penalties of one
3 hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation
4 and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
5 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f).

6 121. Section 2699, subdivision (a) provides that civil penalties may be "recovered
7 through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other
8 current or former employees." (Code Civ. Proc., § 2699, subd. (a).) Section 2699, subdivision (g),
9 provides that an employee who prevails in a civil action under section 2699 shall be entitled to an
10 award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

11 122. The State of California, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees are, therefore, entitled
12 to civil penalties, attorneys' fees and costs, according to proof.

13 14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

17 **Class Certification**

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

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

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

22 **As to the First Cause of Action**

23 4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
24 Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 551, 552, 1194, 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by
25 willfully failing to pay all wages due;

26 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

27 6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the
28

1 date such amounts were due;

2 7. For liquidated damages;

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

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

7 As to the Second Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

17 As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

25 19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
26 appropriate.
27
28

1 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

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

5 21. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(c);

6 22. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this Section, pursuant to
7 California Labor Code § 226(h);

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

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

11 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

20 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
21 appropriate.
22

23 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

24 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated Labor Code §
25 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

26 31. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
27 appropriate;
28

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

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

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

6 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

7 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
8 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked,
9 failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing
10 to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours
11 worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to
12 indemnify necessary business expenses;

13 36. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and
14 prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

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

21 39. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this Section, pursuant to
22 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

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

26 As to the Eighth Cause of Action
27
28

1 41. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the
2 California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked, failing to provide meal
3 periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit
4 rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods,
5 failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay final wages at termination,
6 and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

7 42. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, et seq., and all
8 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

9 43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
10 California Labor Code § 2699;

11 44. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
12 appropriate.
13

14
15 As to all Causes of Action

16 45. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.
17

18 Dated: June 7, 2023

TUNYAN LAW, APC

19
20 
21 _____

22 Lilit Tunyan
23 Artur Tunyan

24 Attorneys for Plaintiff JESUS GALVAN
25
26
27
28

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

Dated: June 7, 2023

Thurs

Attorneys for Plaintiff JESUS GALVAN

Exhibit “A”



TUNYAN LAW

Lilit Tunyan, Esq.
1336 Rossmoyne Avenue,
Glendale, CA 91207
Tel: (323) 410-5050
ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com

March 30, 2023

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Return Receipt Requested

Western Sky Dairy, LLC
18501 Old River Road
Bakersfield, CA 93311

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Return Receipt Requested

Agent for Service of Process for
Western Sky Dairy, LLC
Barry L Goldner
10000 Stockdale Highway Suite 200
Bakersfield, CA 93311

**NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE SECTION § 2698 ET SEQ.**

Re: *Jesus Galvan v. Western Sky Dairy, LLC*

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Jesus Galvan ("Plaintiff") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§

2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer Western Sky Dairy, LLC (“Defendant”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which Plaintiff alleges Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant’s aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of himself as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Kern County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a milker from approximately May 2019 to March 24, 2023, primarily in Kern County. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Plaintiff typically worked 6 days per week, and between 9 to 12 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiff’s employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff’s experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. “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.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the

employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked including straight time wages and overtime wages. Defendant regularly used a system of time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendant's operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate time records and falsified Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' time records. Defendant maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work "off-the-clock", but Plaintiff and the Aggrieved employees were only required to input their scheduled start time despite the fact that they would arrive earlier than their scheduled start time to perform some preparatory work like turning on the machines and other preparatory work. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to arrive earlier than their scheduled shift start to make sure they have enough time to clock in to work on time without waiting in line with other employees using a single tablet in their jobsite to clock in to work. Often times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to clock out for their first meal period and continue working. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that

were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than ten hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees would often times miss their meal periods, have interrupted or short meal periods. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees would often times take their first meal periods late, sometimes even after the seventh hour of work or clock out for meal period but continue working since their supervisors would instruct them to take meal periods one by one to make sure the work of the machines is never stopped or interrupted. In those occasions when Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had an opportunity to take their first meal periods, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved employees to combine their 30-minute first meal periods with their first rest periods and have one 45- minute combined meal and rest break instead of taking separate meal periods and separate rest periods. When Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked more than ten hours they have never been authorized or taken their second meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant

did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant did not schedule rest periods every four hours or a major fraction. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were instructed to make sure the work of the machines is not stopped or interrupted. Instead, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved employees to take only one rest period during their shift, to combine their 30-minute first meal periods with their first rest periods and to take combined one 45-minute first meal and rest break instead of taking separate meal periods and separate rest periods. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have never been authorized and taken their second and third rest periods when they worked shifts of eight hours or longer. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant failed to maintain accurate time records. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved employees were only required to input their scheduled start time versus actual time, Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' time was wrongfully rounded. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to record their first meal period time regardless of whether it was actually taken or not.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to the directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement. Defendant required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to use their personal cell phones for work to communicate with supervisors regarding the work assignments. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for personal cell phone usage. Additionally, Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the masks they were required to purchase when COVID pandemic started. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

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

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

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

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).

The statute further provides: "An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees." Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked. Moreover, during some pay periods Defendant failed to state the hourly rate, the total hours worked, the pay period beginning and end date in the wage statements at all.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant's failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendants also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Lab. Code § 204(a). The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Lab. Code § 204(d).

Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were also entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owe employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
8. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address and address of the agent for service, as indicated on the first page.

The facts and claims contained herein are based on the information available at the time of this writing. Therefore, if through discovery and/or expert review, Plaintiff becomes aware of additional compensation owed or losses incurred by Plaintiff or by any other aggrieved employee of Defendant or any additional facts, Plaintiff expressly reserves the right to revise these facts and/or add any new claims by amending the claim letter or by adding applicable causes of action to the complaint which will relate back to the date of this letter.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. Tunyan", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Lilit Tunyan, Esq.
Partner
TUNYAN LAW, APC

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION		COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
- Complete items 1, 2, and 3. - Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. - Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.		A. Signature ☒ X  ☐ Agent ☐ Addressee	
1. Article Addressed to: Western Sky Dairy, LLC 18501 Old River Road Bakersfield, CA 93311		B. Received by (Printed Name) _____ C. Date of Delivery _____	
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label): 9590 9402 8037 2349 8175 52		D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes ☐ No If YES, enter delivery address below: _____	
3. Service Type ☐ Adult Signature ☐ Priority Mail Express® ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery ☐ Registered Mail™ ☐ Certified Mail® ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery ☐ Signature Confirmation™ ☐ Collect on Delivery ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery ☐ Mail Restricted Delivery (C)			
PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053		Domestic Return Receipt	

USPS TRACKING #		First-Class Mail Postage & Fees Paid USPS Permit No. G-10
9590 9402 8037 2349 8175 52		
United States Postal Service		
* Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box*		
 TUNYAN LAW, APC 1336 Rossmoyne Ave. Glendale, CA 91207		

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete Items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. **Barry L Goldner**
Agent for Service of Process for
Western Sky Dairy, LLC
10000 Stockdale Highway Suite 200
Bakersfield, CA 93311



9590 9402 8037 2349 8175 21

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7022 1670 0001 3766 3094

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

[Signature]

☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

Eric Isidor

C. Date of Delivery

4-3-23

D. Is delivery address different from Item 1? ☐ Yes

If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Registered Mail
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Full Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

USPS TRACKING#



9590 9402 8037 2349 8175 21


United States
 Postal Service

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box•



TUNYAN LAW, APC
1336 Rossmoyne Ave.
Glendale, CA 91207

First-Class Mail
 Postage & Fees Paid
 USPS
 Permit No. G-10



7022 1670 0001 3766 3087

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
 Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com

Bakersfield, CA 93311

Certified Mail Fee \$4.15
 Extra Services & Fees: Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$0.00
 Return Receipt (electronic) \$0.00
 Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$0.00
 Adult Signature Required \$0.00
 Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Postage \$1.74
 Total Postage and Fees \$9.24

03/30/2023

Sent To: Western Sky Dairy, LLC
 18501 Old River Road
 Bakersfield, CA 93311

City, State, ZIP+4®

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9001, 1-1 See Reverse for Instructions

7022 1670 0001 3766 3094

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
 Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com

Bakersfield, CA 93311

Certified Mail Fee \$4.15
 Extra Services & Fees: Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$0.00
 Return Receipt (electronic) \$0.00
 Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$0.00
 Adult Signature Required \$0.00
 Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Postage \$1.74
 Total Postage and Fees \$9.24

03/30/2023

Sent To: Barry L. Goldner, Agent for Service of
 Process for Western Sky Dairy, LLC
 10000 Stockdale Highway Suite 200
 Bakersfield, CA 93311

City, State, ZIP+4®

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9001, 1-1 See Reverse for Instructions



VERDUGO VIEJO
 101 N VERDUGO RD
 GLENDALE, CA 91206-9998
 (800)275-8777

03/30/2023		11:30 AM	
Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$1.74
Bakersfield, CA 93311			
Weight: 0 lb 2.60 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date Sat 04/01/2023			
Certified Mail®			\$4.15
Tracking #:			
70221670000137663094			
Return Receipt			\$3.35
Tracking #:			
9590 9402 8037 2349 8175 21			
Total			\$9.24
First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$1.74
Bakersfield, CA 93311			
Weight: 0 lb 2.60 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date Sat 04/01/2023			
Certified Mail®			\$4.15
Tracking #:			
70221670000137663087			
Return Receipt			\$3.35
Tracking #:			
9590 9402 8037 2349 8175 52			
Total			\$9.24
Grand Total:			\$18.48
Credit Card Remit			\$18.48
Card Name: VISA			
Account #: XXXXXXXXXXXX0153			
Approval #: 00776G			
Transaction #: 324			
AID: A0000G00031010 Contactless			
AL: VISA CREDIT			
CHASE VISA			

From: noreply@salesforce.com on behalf of **LWDA DO NOT REPLY**
To: ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com
Subject: Thank you for submission of your PAGA Case.
Date: Thursday, March 30, 2023 9:59:44 AM

3/30/2023

LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-945264-23
Law Firm : Tunyan Law, APC
Plaintiff Name : Jesus Galvan
Employer: Western Sky Dairy, LLC
Filing Fee : \$75.00
IFP Claimed : No

Item submitted: Initial PAGA Notice

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency. Please make a note of the LWDA Case No. above as you may need this number for future reference when filing any subsequent documents for this Case.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **JOINT STIPULATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT; [PROPOSED] ORDER** on the interested parties in this action by sending a true copy thereof to interested parties as follows and as stated on the attached service list:

***Attorneys for Defendant WESTERN SKY
DAIRY, LLC***

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** Based on a court order, Rule of Court, or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses listed above via electronic mail. I did not receive an error message.

Executed on June 7, 2023, at Los Angeles, California.

Thurs

Signature