

2/23/2024 4:23 PM

By: Sylvia Guajardo, DEPUTY

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104

KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672

JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 280626

ALEX J. VALLE, State Bar No. 334263

9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100

Irvine, California 92618

Telephone: (949) 379-6250

Facsimile: (949) 379-6251

Email: jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com

avalle@aegislawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Kinaya Foster Anderson, individually,
and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

KINAYA FOSTER ANDERSON,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FAMILY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM; and
DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB 2306895

*Assigned for All Purposes to:
Hon. Thomas S. Garza; Dept.S-27*

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
4. Failure to Permit Rest Breaks;
5. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
7. Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Separation of Employment; and
8. Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

1 Plaintiff Kinaya Foster Anderson, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,
2 alleges as follows:

3 **NATURE OF ACTION AND INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff Kinaya Foster Anderson (“Plaintiff”) brings this putative class action and
5 representative action against defendants Family Assistance Program, and DOES 1 through 20,
6 inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), on Plaintiff’s own behalf and on behalf of California
7 citizens who are and were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees throughout
8 California.

9 2. Defendants provide services or goods throughout California.

10 3. Through this action, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants engaged in a systematic
11 pattern of wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare
12 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders, all of which contribute to Defendants’ deliberate unfair
13 competition.

14 4. Plaintiff is informed and believe, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have
15 increased their profits by violating state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 16 (a) failing to pay all wages (including minimum wages and overtime wages);
- 17 (b) failing to provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- 18 (c) failing to authorize or permit lawful rest breaks or provide compensation
19 in lieu thereof;
- 20 (d) failing to reimburse necessary business-related costs;
- 21 (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- 22 (f) failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.

23 5. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of Plaintiff and all
24 others similarly situated in California to recover, among other things, unpaid wages, un-
25 reimbursed business expenses, benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, and
26 penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174,
27 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and Code of California Civil
28 Procedure § 1021.5.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 20 are or were the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers, or employees of Defendants at all relevant times.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendant, carried out a joint scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the other defendant. Furthermore, defendants in all respects acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the class members.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendants and/or DOES 1 through 20, acting as the agent or alter ego for the other, with legal authority to act on the other's behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent, the official policy of Defendants.

16. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the scope of such agency or employment, or ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

18. Plaintiff brings this action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated who were affected by Defendants' Labor Code, Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, and IWC Wage Order violations.

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

20. Plaintiff's proposed class consists of and is defined as follows:

Class

1 All California citizens currently or formerly employed by Defendants as non-
2 exempt employees in the State of California at any time between October 3, 2018¹
3 and the date of class certification (“Class”).

4 21. Plaintiff also seeks to certify the following subclasses of employees:

5 Waiting Time Subclass

6 All members of the Class who separated their employment with Defendants at any
7 time between October 3, 2019 and the date of class certification (“Waiting Time
8 Subclass”).

9 22. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify or re-define the Class, establish additional
10 subclasses, or modify or re-define any class or subclass definition as appropriate based on
11 investigation, discovery, and specific theories of liability.

12 23. Members of the Class and the Waiting Time Subclass described above will be
13 collectively referred to as “Class Members.”

14 24. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class Members that
15 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members including, but not limited to,
16 the following:

- 17 (a) Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages
18 (including minimum wages and overtime wages) for all hours worked by
19 Plaintiff and Class Members.
- 20 (b) Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to work over
21 eight (8) hours per day, over twelve (12) hours per day, and/or over forty
22 (40) hours per week and failed to pay them proper overtime compensation
23 for all overtime hours worked.
- 24
- 25
- 26

27 ¹ The statute of limitations for this matter was tolled between April 6, 2020 and October 1, 2020
28 pursuant to Cal. Rules of Court, Appendix I, Emergency Rule No. 9.

- 1 (c) Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of timely meal
2 periods or required Plaintiff and Class Members to work through meal
3 periods without legal compensation.
- 4 (d) Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of rest breaks
5 or required Plaintiff and Class Members to work through rest breaks.
- 6 (e) Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for
7 necessary business-related costs expended for the benefit of Defendants.
- 8 (f) Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members
9 accurate itemized wage statements.
- 10 (g) Whether Defendants failed to timely pay the Waiting Time Subclass all
11 wages due upon termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of
12 resignation.
- 13 (h) Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless.
- 14 (i) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
15 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

16 25. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the proposed
17 Class and subclasses are readily ascertainable:

18 (a) Numerosity: The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all
19 members is impractical. Although the members of the Class are unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
20 on information and belief, the Class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals. The
21 identities of the Class Members are readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants'
22 employment and payroll records.

23 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of the claims
24 (or defenses, if any) of the Class Members because Defendants' failure to comply with the
25 provisions of California's wage and hour laws entitled each Class Member to similar pay,
26 benefits, and other relief. The injuries sustained by Plaintiff are also typical of the injuries
27 sustained by the Class Members, because they arise out of and are caused by Defendants'
28 common course of conduct as alleged herein.

1 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the
2 interests of all Class Members because it is in Plaintiff's best interest to prosecute the claims
3 alleged herein to obtain full compensation and penalties due. Plaintiff's attorneys, as proposed
4 class counsel, are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions and
5 versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has
6 incurred and, throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur attorneys' fees and
7 costs that have been and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the
8 substantial benefit of the Class Members.

9 (d) Superiority: The nature of this action makes use of class action
10 adjudication superior to other methods. A class action will achieve economies of time, effort, and
11 expense as compared with separate lawsuits and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the
12 same issues can be adjudicated in the same manner for the entire Class and Waiting Time
13 Subclass at the same time. If appropriate, this Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods
14 to efficiently manage this case as a class action.

15 (e) Public Policy Considerations: Employers in the State of California violate
16 employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights
17 out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions
18 because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through
19 negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide class members who are not named
20 in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights while
21 affording them privacy protections.

22 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

23 26. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other
24 California residents as non-exempt employees throughout California at Defendants' California
25 business location(s).

26 27. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

27 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
28 mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees, and other professionals who

1 were knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel
2 practices, and the requirements of California law.

3 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
4 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive wages for all time
5 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages) and that they were not receiving all
6 wages earned for work that was required to be performed. In violation of the Labor Code and
7 IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid all wages (including minimum
8 wages and overtime wages) for all hours worked at the correct rate and within the correct time.

9 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
10 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive all required meal
11 periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular
12 rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted meal period. In violation of the
13 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive all meal periods
14 or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate of
15 pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted meal period.

16 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
17 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive all rest breaks or
18 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate of pay
19 when a rest break was late, missed, or interrupted. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage
20 Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive all rest breaks or payment of one (1)
21 additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Class Members' regular rate of pay when a rest break
22 was missed, late, or interrupted.

23 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
24 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to reimbursement and/or
25 indemnification for all necessary business expenditures or losses as a direct consequence of the
26 discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants. In violation of the
27 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members incurred necessary business
28 expenses or losses, but were not reimbursed nor indemnified of such expenses or losses that were

1 incurred as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the
2 directions of Defendants.

3 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
4 should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive itemized wage
5 statements that accurately showed the following information pursuant to the Labor Code: (1)
6 gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of piece-rate units
7 earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all
8 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
9 aggregated and shown as one item; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for
10 which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or
11 her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security
12 number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable
13 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at
14 each hourly rate by the employee. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and Class Members
15 were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

16 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
17 should have known that the Waiting Time Subclass was entitled to timely payment of wages due
18 upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, the Waiting Time Subclass did
19 not receive payment of all wages within the permissible time periods.

20 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
21 should have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members, and Defendants
22 had the financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally
23 failed to do so in order to increase Defendants' profits.

24 36. Therefore, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking monetary relief against Defendants
25 on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all Class Members to recover, among other things,
26 unpaid wages (including minimum wages and overtime wages), unpaid meal period premium
27 payments, unpaid rest period premium payments, unreimbursed business expenditures, interest,
28 attorneys' fees, penalties, costs, and expenses.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

3 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, and 1197; Violation of IWC Wage Order §3-4)

4 37. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
5 though fully set forth herein.

6 38. Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 provide that the minimum wage for employees
7 fixed by the IWC is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser
8 wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

9 39. Plaintiff and Class Members were employees entitled to the protections of Labor
10 Code §§ 1194 and 1197.

11 40. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class
12 Members all wages owed when Defendants did not pay minimum wage for all hours worked.

13 41. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay at least minimum wage
14 to Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197.

15 42. Specifically, Defendants assigned Plaintiff tasks on short notice, that required
16 Plaintiff to work extra hours, while not clocked-in, to meet tight deadlines. For example,
17 Defendants required Plaintiff to complete tasks that were assigned to her at the end of her shift
18 on Friday that needed to be completed by Monday, requiring her to work extra hours.

19 43. Moreover, Defendants required Plaintiff to use her personal cell phone to respond
20 to business needs while not clocked-in, such as on the weekends. Plaintiff estimates that these
21 violations occurred multiple times per month between November 2019 and June 2021.

22 44. Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to sign illegal on-duty meal
23 period agreements. Despite the on-duty meal period agreement stating that Class Members
24 would be paid for working through their meal breaks, and Plaintiff signed an on-duty meal
25 period agreement, Defendants required Plaintiff to perform job duties during her meal periods,
26 but Defendants deducted a meal period from that day's total hours worked when calculating
27 payment to Plaintiff for working hours. For example, on January 4, 2021, Plaintiff was paid for 8
28

1 hours of work, but actually worked 9 hours as she was required to be on-duty during her meal
2 period break.

3 45. Further, Defendants paid Plaintiff for scheduled time rather than her actual time
4 worked, which did not pay her for work performed as explained herein.

5 46. Plaintiff believes other Class Members suffered violations from the same common
6 policies.

7 47. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the required minimum
8 wage violates Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197. Pursuant to these sections, Plaintiff and Class
9 Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as
10 well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

11 48. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
12 recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and the accrued
13 interest thereon.

14 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME**

16 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 3)

17 49. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
18 though fully set forth herein.

19 50. Labor Code § 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that it is
20 unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either one and one-half
21 (1½) or two (2) times the person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours
22 worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

23 51. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Orders provide that Defendants are and
24 were required to pay overtime compensation to Plaintiff and Class Members at the rate of one
25 and one-half times (1½) their regular rate of pay when working and for all hours worked in
26 excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek and for the first
27 eight (8) hours of work on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

1 52. The applicable IWC Wage Orders further provide that Defendants are and were
2 required to pay overtime compensation to Plaintiff and Class Members at a rate of two times
3 their regular rate of pay when working and for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in
4 a day or in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

5 53. California Labor Code § 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one
6 and one-half (1½) times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a
7 day or forty (40) hours in a week and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh
8 consecutive day of work, and overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours
9 worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the
10 seventh day of work in a workweek.

11 54. Labor Code § 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders provide that employment
12 of more than six days in a workweek is only permissible if the employer pays proper overtime
13 compensation as set forth herein.

14 55. Plaintiff and Class Members were employees entitled to the protections of
15 California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194.

16 56. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members
17 to work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, forty (40) hours in a week, and/or on a seventh
18 consecutive day of work, entitling them to overtime wages.

19 57. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class
20 Members overtime wages for all overtime hours worked. To the extent these hours qualify for
21 the payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid proper overtime
22 wages.

23 58. For example, Defendants paid Class Members non-discretionary bonuses, yet
24 failed to adjust the regular rates of pay for overtime hours worked and sick pay to account for
25 these bonuses. Plaintiff received one such bonus on December 12, 2019 and another on
26 December 24, 2020.

27 59. Defendants assigned Plaintiff tasks on short notice, that required Plaintiff to work
28 extra hours, while not clocked-in, to meet tight deadlines. For example, Defendants required

1 Plaintiff to complete tasks that were assigned to her at the end of her shift on Friday that needed
2 to be completed by Monday, requiring her to work extra hours.

3 60. Moreover, Defendants required Plaintiff to use her personal cell phone to respond
4 to business needs while not clocked-in, such as on the weekends. Plaintiff estimates that these
5 violations occurred multiple times between November 2019 and June 2021.

6 61. Defendants also required Plaintiff to perform job duties during her meal periods,
7 but Defendants deducted Plaintiff's meal period from that day's total hours worked when
8 calculating payment to Plaintiff for working hours.

9 62. Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to sign illegal on-duty meal
10 period agreements.

11 63. Plaintiff believes other Class Members suffered violations from the same common
12 policies.

13 64. In violation of California law, Defendants knowingly and willfully refused to
14 perform their obligations and compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for all wages earned and
15 all hours worked.

16 65. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the unpaid balance of
17 overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of Labor Code §§
18 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

19 66. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
20 recover their unpaid overtime and double time compensation as well as interest, costs, and
21 attorneys' fees.

22 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

24 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 11)

25 67. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
26 though fully set forth herein.

27 68. Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work
28 during any meal period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

1 69. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states, “[n]o employer shall
2 employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not
3 less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will
4 complete the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and
5 the employee.”

6 70. Labor Code § 512(a) provides that an employer may not require, cause, or permit
7 an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the
8 employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if
9 the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may
10 be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

11 71. Labor Code § 512(a) also provides that an employer may not employ an employee
12 for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a
13 second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no
14 more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the
15 employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

16 72. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive
17 compliant meal periods for working more than five (5) and ten (10) hours per day because their
18 meal periods were missed, late, short, interrupted, and/or they were not permitted to take a
19 second meal period.

20 73. Defendants maintained an illegal meal period policy allowing meals only after
21 working five hours during one shift.

22 74. Defendant required Plaintiff and Class Members to sign illegal on-duty meal
23 period agreements that required Plaintiff and other Class Members to perform job duties during
24 their meal periods.

25 75. Defendants interrupted Plaintiff’s meal periods numerous times between
26 November 2019 and June 2021 by requiring her to work through her meal periods, and
27 Defendant’s policies required Plaintiff and other Class Members to remain on Defendant’s
28 premises during meal periods. Defendants also failed to timely provide meal periods, and instead

1 recording meal periods set at a designated time, regardless of whether Plaintiff took a meal
2 period at that time. On other occasions, Plaintiff was not able to take her meal periods before the
3 fifth hour of work because Defendants required her to complete assignments that were due at a
4 specified time.

5 76. Plaintiff believes other Class Members suffered violations from the same common
6 policies.

7 77. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order require
8 an employer to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
9 compensation for each work day that a compliant meal period is not provided.

10 78. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members meal
11 period premiums for missed, late, and/or short meal periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b)
12 and section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

13 79. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members an
14 additional hour of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided, Plaintiff and
15 Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO PERMIT REST BREAKS**

18 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 12)

19 80. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
20 though fully set forth herein.

21 81. Labor Code § 226.7(a) provides that no employer shall require an employee to
22 work during any rest period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

23 82. Section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states "[e]very employer shall
24 authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in
25 the middle of each work period[,]" and the "[a]uthorized rest period time shall be based on the
26 total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major
27 fraction thereof[,]" unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.
28

1 83. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive a ten
2 (10) minute rest period for every four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked, including
3 working in excess of ten (10) hours in a day, because they were required to work through their
4 rest periods and/or were not authorized to take their rest periods.

5 84. Defendants maintained facially illegal meal period policies that provided rest
6 breaks “for any shift of four (4) or more hours” rather than four (4) hours *or major fraction*
7 *thereof*.

8 85. Additionally, Defendants interrupted Plaintiff’s rest breaks each week by calling
9 her on her personal cell phone and requiring her to respond to calls from clients during her rest
10 breaks. On other occasions, Plaintiff was not able to take her rest breaks because Defendants
11 required her to complete assignments that were due at a specified time. Plaintiff estimates that
12 this violation occurred multiple times between November 2019 and June 2021.

13 86. Plaintiff believes other Class Members suffered violations from the same common
14 policies.

15 87. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order requires
16 an employer to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of
17 compensation for each work day that a compliant rest period is not provided.

18 88. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members rest
19 period premiums for missed, late, and/or interrupted rest periods pursuant to Labor Code §
20 226.7(b) and section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

21 89. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members an
22 additional hour of pay for each day a compliant rest period was not provided, Plaintiff and Class
23 Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

24 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

26 (Violation of Labor Code §§ 2800, 2802)

27 90. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
28 though fully set forth herein.

1 91. Labor Code § 2800 states that “[a]n employer shall in all cases indemnify his
2 employee for losses caused by the employer’s want of ordinary care.”

3 92. Labor Code § 2802(a) states that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her
4 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
5 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
6 the employer”

7 93. Labor Code § 2802(b) states that “[a]ll awards made by a court . . . for
8 reimbursement of necessary expenditures under this section shall carry interest at the same rate
9 as judgments in civil actions. Interest shall accrue from the date on which the employee incurred
10 the necessary expenditure or loss.”

11 94. Labor Code § 2802(c) states that “[f]or purposes of this section, the term
12 “necessary expenditures or losses” shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited
13 to, attorney’s fees incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section.”

14 95. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members incurred necessary
15 business-related costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants.

16 96. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff to use her personal cell phone for
17 business purposes during her shifts, but did not provide reimbursements for such expenses to
18 Plaintiff until March 2021.

19 97. Defendants also failed to properly reimburse Plaintiff for mileage when it
20 required Plaintiff to drive her own car for business purposes. Defendants paid Plaintiff a lump
21 sum in a lesser amount than the expenses incurred.

22 98. Beginning in March 2020, Plaintiff was required to work at home during the
23 COVID-19 pandemic, and incurred expenses for the purchase of a work computer, printer, paper
24 and ink, a home office, and home internet use, yet was not reimbursed by Defendant.

25 99. Furthermore, Defendants promised Plaintiff that it would reimburse her for health
26 insurance costs in accordance with its policies. However, Defendants did not reimburse Plaintiff
27 despite Plaintiff’s repeated inquiries.
28

1 and Class Members. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly state
2 the gross and net wages earned, total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect, and the
3 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by Plaintiff and Class Members. The gross and net
4 wages earned were and are inaccurate because they do not include payment for Plaintiff's and
5 the Class Members' work off-the-clock, and the hours worked were and are inaccurate for the
6 same reason.

7 106. Additionally, Defendants issued Plaintiff and other Class Members electronic
8 wage statements that only listed the check number, pay date, taxes deducted, gross pay,
9 additional deductions, and net pay. Thus, the wage statements contained violations, including,
10 but not limited to, the wrong inclusive dates of the pay period, wrong hours, and wrong rate of
11 pay.

12 107. Furthermore, other paystubs that Defendants provided to Plaintiff listed the wrong
13 gross pay. For example, on March 19, 2020, Plaintiff's pay stub included "Retro Pay" for 1 hour
14 of work at a rate of pay of \$112.00 per hour. Plaintiff believes these amounts were inaccurate
15 and cannot tell what this item represents.

16 108. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
17 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-
18 protected rights. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members are deemed to suffer an injury
19 pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) where, as here, Defendants intentionally violated Labor Code §
20 226(a). Plaintiff and Class Members were denied both their legal right to receive, and their
21 protected interest in receiving, accurate itemized wage statements under Labor Code § 226(a). In
22 addition, because Defendants failed to provide the accurate rates of pay on wage statements,
23 Defendants prevented Plaintiff and Class Members from determining if all hours worked were
24 paid at the appropriate rate and the extent of the underpayment. Plaintiff had to file this lawsuit
25 in order to analyze the extent of the underpayment, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses
26 and lost time. Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had
27 Defendants provided the accurate hours worked, wages earned, and rates of pay. This has also
28 delayed Plaintiff's ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

109. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of all actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) or fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods in an amount not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) per employee, plus attorneys' fees and costs.

110. Defendants' violations of California Labor Code § 226(a) prevented Plaintiff and Class Members from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wages paid to them and resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered an injury, in the exact amount of damages and/or penalties to be shown according to proof at trial.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE UPON SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT

(Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203)

111. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

112. 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 an intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

113. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay the Waiting Time Subclass, which includes Plaintiff, all their earned wages upon termination, either at the time of discharge or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

114. The waiting time violations are derivative of the unpaid wage, meal period, and rest break violations described herein.

115. Defendants' failure to pay the Waiting Time Subclass all their earned wages at the time of discharge or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ is in violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

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

117. Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, the Waiting Time Subclass is entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty, which is defined as the Waiting Time Subclass members' regular daily wages at their regular hourly rate of pay for each day they were not paid, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17200, ET SEQ.

(Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

118. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

119. California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair competition, which includes any “unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice . . .”

120. A violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, may be predicated on a violation of any state or federal law. In the instant case, Defendants' policies and practices violated state law, causing Plaintiff and Class Members to suffer and continue to suffer injuries-in-fact.

121. Defendants' policies and practices violated state law in at least the following respects:

- 1 (a) Failing to pay all wages earned (including minimum wage and overtime
2 wages) to Plaintiff and Class Members at the proper rate and in a timely
3 manner in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198.
- 4 (b) Failing to provide compliant meal periods without paying Plaintiff and
5 Class Members premium wages for every day said meal periods were not
6 provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.
- 7 (c) Failing to authorize or permit compliant rest breaks without paying
8 Plaintiff and Class Members premium wages for every day said rest
9 breaks were not authorized or permitted in violation of Labor Code §
10 226.7.
- 11 (d) Failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for necessary business-
12 related expenses in violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802.

13 122. As alleged herein, Defendants systematically engaged in unlawful conduct in
14 violation of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, such as failing to pay all wages
15 (minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods and rest breaks or
16 compensation in lieu thereof, failing to reimburse necessary business-related costs and
17 expenses, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to pay all wages due and
18 owing upon separation of employment in a timely manner to the Waiting Time Subclass, all in
19 order to decrease their costs of doing business and increase their profits.

20 123. At all relevant times herein, Defendants held themselves out to Plaintiff and Class
21 Members as being knowledgeable concerning the labor and employment laws of California.

22 124. At all times relevant herein, Defendants intentionally avoided paying Plaintiff and
23 Class Members wages and monies, thereby creating for Defendants an artificially lower cost of
24 doing business in order to undercut their competitors and establish and/or gain a greater
25 foothold in the marketplace.

26 125. By violating the foregoing statutes and regulations as herein alleged, Defendants'
27 acts constitute unfair and unlawful business practices under California Business and Professions
28 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

126. As a result of the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to restitution in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

127. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, Class Members, and the general public. Based on Defendants' conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

On Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 of the proposed Class and any other appropriate subclass;
2. For appointment of Kinaya Foster Anderson as class representative;
3. For appointment of Aegis Law Firm, PC, as class counsel for all purposes;
4. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof at trial;
5. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but not limited to, unpaid wages, unreimbursed expenses, benefits, and penalties;
6. For economic and/or special damages in an amount according to proof at trial;
7. For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2;
8. For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
9. For restitution as provided by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
10. For pre-judgment interest;
11. For civil penalties;

1 12. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted
2 by law, including, but not limited to, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and Labor Code §§
3 226(e), and 1194; and

4 13. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

5
6 Dated: February 23, 2024

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

7
8 
9

10
11 By: _____
12 Jessica L. Campbell
13 Alex J. Valle
14 Attorneys for Plaintiff Kinaya Foster Anderson
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I, the undersigned, am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over
3 the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; am employed with Aegis Law Firm PC and
4 my business address is 9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100, Irvine, California 92618. On
5 February 23, 2024, I served the foregoing document(s) entitled:

6 • **SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

7 on all the appearing and/or interested parties in this action by delivering ☐ the original ☒ a true
8 copy thereof on the party(ies) addressed below as follows:

9 Kirsten Miller
10 Kathrin A. Wanner
11 **MILLER WANNER LLP**
12 515 S. Flower Street 18th Floor
13 Los Angeles, CA 90071
14 Tel: 213 236 3523
15 Fax: 213 341 2224
16 kmiller@millervanner.com
17 kwanner@millervanner.com

18 *Attorneys for Defendant:*
19 **FAMILY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

20 ☐ **(BY MAIL)** I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing
21 correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S.
22 Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Irvine, California
23 in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service
24 is presumed invalid if postage cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one
25 day after date of deposit for mailing this affidavit. (*Cal Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a); Fed.*
26 *R. Civ. Proc. 5(a); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(c).*)

27 ☐ **(BY OVERNIGHT MAIL)** I am personally and readily familiar with the business
28 practice of Aegis Law Firm PC for collection and processing correspondence for
overnight delivery, and I caused such document(s) described herein to be deposited for
delivery to a facility regularly maintained Federal Express for overnight delivery. (*Cal*
Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(c).)

☒ **(BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION)** I caused said document(s) to be served via
electronic transmission via the above listed email addresses on the date below. (*Cal.*
Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(6); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(b)(2)(E); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(b)(3).)

☐ **(BY PERSONAL SERVICE)** I delivered the foregoing document by hand delivery to
the addressed named above. (*Cal Code Civ. Proc. § 1011; Fed. R. Civ. Proc.*
5(b)(2)(A).)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
foregoing is true and correct. Executed on February 23, 2024, at Irvine, California.



Genesis Pena