

CASE ATTACHMENT COVER PAGE	(ENDORSED) ELECTRONICALLY FILED BY SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Bernardino on Jul 21, 2023 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT <i>Deputy Clerk: Rina L. Phillips</i>
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO STREET ADDRESS: 247 West Third Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Bernardino, CA 92415 BRANCH NAME: San Bernardino Justice Center WEBSITE: http://www.sb-court.org	
ATTACHMENT NAME: Answer: First Amended Complaint	
CASE NAME: Virginia Alvarado vs. Alta Resources Corp.	CASE NUMBER: CIVSB2304861
Please log on to www.TurboCourt.com regularly for updates	

Please staple this to your original attachment

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Kristina Bui Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 294924]
kristina@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513
Riverside, CA 92504
Tel: (951) 320-1444 | Fax: (951) 320-1445

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

VIRGINIA ALVARADO, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

ALTA RESOURCES CORP., a Wisconsin
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 20,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: CIVSB2304861
*[Assigned to Hon. Judge Joseph Ortiz, Dept
S17, for all purposes]*

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
- (7) Unfair and Unlawful Competition;

PAGA CLAIMS

- (8) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (9) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (10) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (11) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (12) Failure to Timely Pay Wages;
- (13) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages; and
- (14) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff Virginia Alvarado (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of herself, on a representative basis,
2 and on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action against her former employer(s), Defendants Alta
5 Resources Corp. (“Alta Resources”) and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively,
6 “Defendants”) on behalf of all current and former nonexempt employees employed by
7 Defendants in California (the “Class” or “Represented Employees”), for Labor Code violations
8 stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay all wages owed, including minimum, regular, and
9 overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest breaks, failure to timely
10 pay wages each period and upon separation of employment, and failure to provide accurate
11 itemized wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately February 2022
13 through January 2023.

14 3. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Represented Employees were
15 subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations
16 to which Plaintiff was subjected during employment.

17 4. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
18 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
19 worked. As one specific example, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were frequently
20 required to perform off-the-clock work at the beginning and end of shifts without compensation.
21 Because this time was spent under Defendants’ control without compensation, this violates
22 California law and led to minimum and overtime wage violations. See *Troester v. Starbucks*
23 *Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law “do[es] not allow employers to require
24 employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without compensation”). See *Frlekin v.*
25 *Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under company’s
26 control and where the tasks served the employer’s interests). See also *Cadena v. Customer*
27 *Connexx LLC* (9th Cir. 2022) 51 F.4th 831 (booting up and shutting down computers is
28 compensable under the FLSA [and therefore the Labor Code]).

1 5. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were also denied 30-minute off-duty
2 meal periods, as mandated by California law. As a result of Defendants' policies and practices,
3 the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable
4 to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal period while under the
5 control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4) forced to take a meal
6 period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated second meal periods for shifts
7 in excess of 10 hours.

8 6. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Represented Employees with
9 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
10 mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks for Plaintiff and the
11 Represented Employees and the Represented Employees were often not authorized and/or
12 permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload.
13 Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees worked longer shifts,
14 Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit mandated third or fourth rest breaks.

15 7. Plaintiff also alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
16 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
17 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
18 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
19 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
20 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, wage premiums, among others.

21 8. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
22 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

23 9. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' violations of the wage and hour components of
24 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their
25 level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over
26 its competitors.

27 10. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
28 Represented Employees' employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees'

1 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
2 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
3 hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
4 underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

5 11. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, injunctive, equitable, and
6 monetary relief against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of herself and the Represented
7 Employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys' fees,
8 penalties, costs and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208,
9 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
10 1199, and 2802, among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the
11 right to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

12 12. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff has provided written notice by
13 online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by certified mail
14 to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated,
15 including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. The waiting period imposed by
16 Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A) has elapsed. In accordance with Labor Code § 2699(g)(1),
17 Plaintiff reserves the right to amend this complaint or bring a separate complaint within 60 days
18 of: 1) receipt of notice from the LWDA that it does not intend to investigate the alleged
19 violation, or 2) if no notice is provided by the LWDA. Pursuant to Labor Code §
20 2699.3(a)(2)(C), "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law, a plaintiff may as a matter of
21 right amend an existing complaint to add a cause of action arising under this part at any time
22 within 60 days of the time periods specified in this part."

23 **II. JURISDICTION**

24 13. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the
25 Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

26 **III. VENUE**

27 14. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil
28 Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in San Bernardino County and the unlawful

acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in San Bernardino County. Furthermore, Defendants employed or employ Plaintiff and Represented Employees in San Bernardino County.

IV. PARTIES

Plaintiff

15. Plaintiff and Class Representative Virginia Alvarado was employed by Defendants from approximately February 2022 through January 2023 and performed work for Defendants in San Bernardino County.

Defendants

16. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Alta Resources is a Wisconsin corporation authorized to and doing business in California. Plaintiff is also informed and believes that Defendant Alta Resources is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

17. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Represented Employees by virtue of Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when ascertained.

18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he and the Represented Employees worked under the joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and each of them, acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a unity of interest and ownership between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as a single employer of Plaintiff and other Represented Employees.

19. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that

1 Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single
2 employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human
3 resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally,
4 Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor
5 operations, and common ownership or financial control.

6 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting
7 themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active
8 concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in
9 all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times
10 Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the
11 agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining
12 co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and
13 purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of
14 their remaining co-Defendants.

15 21. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants
16 have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate
17 corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which
18 Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly,
19 the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed
20 jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the
21 separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege,
22 thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

23 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

24 22. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
25 (the "Complaint") as if fully alleged herein.

26 23. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated as
27 a class action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

28 24. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning

four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

25. The Class, also referred to as the “Represented Employees,” that Plaintiff seeks to represent is defined as follows:

All current and former nonexempt employees employed by Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.

26. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

Meal Break Subclass

All Represented Employees who worked a shift in excess of 5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

Rest Break Subclass

All Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

Waiting Time Penalties Subclass

All Represented Employees who separated from their employment with Defendants during the period three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is entered.

Wage Statement Penalties Subclass

All Represented Employees during the period one year before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is entered.

27. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues as appropriate.

28. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that she seeks to represent.

29. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable from Defendants’ records.

1 30. **Numerosity:** The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that
2 a joinder of all Represented Employees is impracticable. Although the exact number is currently
3 unknown to Plaintiff, this information is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

4 31. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which
5 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including
6 without limitation:

7 i. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
8 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all
9 hours worked;

10 ii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
11 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
12 Employees for hours above 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week;

13 iii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
14 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Meal Break
15 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
16 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a compliant
17 meal period was not provided;

18 iv. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
19 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Rest Break
20 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass
21 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a paid rest
22 break was not provided;

23 v. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
24 timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment between Defendants and Plaintiff and
25 the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass, whether such separation was voluntary or involuntary;

26 vi. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
27 provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized
28 wage statements;

vii. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, and failure to timely pay final wages; and

viii. Whether Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

32. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims, as the Class Representative, are typical of the claims of The Class. Plaintiff, like other members of The Class, was subjected to Defendants' ongoing Labor Code and Wage Order violations including pertaining to the failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to provide mandated paid rest breaks, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

33. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff, as the Class Representative, will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's interests are not in conflict with those of the Class. Class Representative's counsel are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions and other complex litigation matters, including cases like this case.

34. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants

1 35. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
2 alleged herein.

3 36. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement
4 to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for
5 each hour worked.

6 37. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided proper minimum and
7 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
8 worked. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were
9 required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they
10 were performing.

11 38. As one specific example, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were
12 frequently required to perform off-the-clock work at the beginning and end of shifts without
13 compensation. Because this time was spent under Defendants' control without compensation,
14 this violates California law and led to minimum and overtime wage violations. See *Troester v.*
15 *Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law "do[es] not allow employers to
16 require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without compensation"). See
17 *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under
18 company's control and where the tasks served the employer's interests). See also *Cadena v.*
19 *Customer Connexx LLC* (9th Cir. 2022) 51 F.4th 831 (booting up and shutting down computers
20 is compensable under the FLSA [and therefore the Labor Code]).

21 39. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
22 the Represented Employees for all hours worked.

23 40. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
24 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
25 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

26 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
27 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
28 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

1 42. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
2 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each
3 hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay
4 them in accordance thereto.

5 43. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
6 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
7 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
8 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
9 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

10 44. During employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
11 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

12 45. As a result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
13 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

14 46. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
15 all unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs of
16 suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1194.2, against Defendants in an amount to be proven
17 at trial.

18 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

20 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

21 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

22 47. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
23 alleged herein.

24 48. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were employees of Defendants who did
25 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

26 49. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
27 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
28 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in

1 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
2 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
3 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

4 50. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required by
5 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to
6 Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked Plaintiff and the
7 Represented Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

8 51. As one specific example, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were
9 frequently required to perform off-the-clock work at the beginning and end of shifts without
10 compensation. Because this time was spent under Defendants' control without compensation,
11 this violates California law and led to minimum and overtime wage violations. See *Troester v.*
12 *Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law "do[es] not allow employers to
13 require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without compensation"). See
14 *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under
15 company's control and where the tasks served the employer's interests). See also *Cadena v.*
16 *Customer Connexx LLC* (9th Cir. 2022) 51 F.4th 831 (booting up and shutting down computers
17 is compensable under the FLSA [and therefore the Labor Code]).

18 52. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
19 the Represented Employees for all overtime hours worked.

20 53. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
21 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees because
22 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
23 week without proper overtime compensation.

24 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
25 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
26 Represented Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

27 55. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
28 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid proper overtime wages throughout the statutory

1 period, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

2 56. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
3 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
4 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
5 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
6 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

7 57. During the employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
8 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

9 58. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
10 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

11 59. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
12 all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against
13 Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

14 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

16 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

17 *Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

18 60. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
19 alleged herein.

20 61. Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
21 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
22 periods.

23 62. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
24 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

25 63. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
26 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
27 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
28 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal

1 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
2 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
3 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

4 64. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
5 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
6 pay for each meal period that is missed.

7 65. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were denied
8 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
9 practices, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations
10 when they were: (1) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty
11 meal period while under the control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period,
12 (4) forced to take a meal period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided a mandated
13 second meal period for shifts in excess of 10 hours.

14 66. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
15 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not provided with all
16 mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass one
17 additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

18 67. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Meal
19 Break Subclass all mandated meal periods and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
20 meal or rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

21 68. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass did not
22 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
23 obtained from Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not willfully obtained, were not
24 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
25 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
26 to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

27 69. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
28 periods as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of

1 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
2 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
3 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal period was not
4 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

5 70. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
6 and IWC Wage Order § 11, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Meal
7 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

8 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

10 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

11 *Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

12 71. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
13 alleged herein.

14 72. Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
15 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

16 73. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
17 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

18 74. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
19 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
20 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
21 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
22 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

23 75. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
24 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
25 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

26 76. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
27 Break Subclass with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
28 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the

1 Rest Break Subclass were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due
2 to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and
3 he Rest Break Subclass worked lengthy shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit
4 mandated third or fourth rest breaks.

5 77. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
6 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were not provided with all
7 mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
8 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

9 78. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
10 Break Subclass all mandated rest breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
11 rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

12 79. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with rest breaks
13 as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of each rest
14 break not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage
15 Order § 12. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at the
16 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a paid rest break was not
17 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

18 80. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
19 and IWC Wage Order § 12, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Rest
20 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

21 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

23 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

24 *Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass against All Defendants*

25 81. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
26 alleged herein.

27 82. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
28 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing

1 and payment of wages.

2 83. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
3 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

4 84. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
5 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
6 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

7 85. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
8 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
9 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

10 86. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby
11 Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass were not paid all wages due and owing upon
12 separation of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

13 87. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all
14 wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass upon separation of
15 employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, overtime, and vacation wages, as
16 well as meal and rest period premiums.

17 88. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
18 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass all
19 wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and
20 202. Consequently, pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendants owe Plaintiff and the Waiting
21 Time Penalties Subclass the above-described waiting time penalty, all in an amount to be shown
22 according to proof at trial and within the jurisdiction of this Court.

23 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

25 (Labor Code § 226)

26 *Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass against All Defendants*

27 89. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
28 alleged herein.

1 90. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
2 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
3 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

4 91. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
5 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
6 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
7 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
8 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
9 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

10 92. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
11 and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass due to violations including: failure to accurately state
12 total hours worked (for example, the wage statements failed to accurately reflect the
13 compensable hours worked); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to accurately
14 state all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the applicable
15 hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay); and failure to accurately state the
16 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

17 93. Additionally, Defendants' wage statements directly violated Labor Code § 226(a)
18 each period due to the failure to pay and report premium wages for denied meal periods and rest
19 breaks under § 226.7.

20 94. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
21 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a
22 wage statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
23 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

24 95. Defendants' failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the
25 Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the
26 calculation and rate of pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore,
27 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting
28 miscalculation of wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said

1 Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered
2 and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost
3 interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully
4 perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to
5 proof at trial.

6 96. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
7 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered an injury in
8 that each was prevented from knowing, understanding and disputing the wage payments paid to
9 them. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have each suffered an
10 injury in that the failure to show all wages earned on the itemized wage statements resulted in
11 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees being denied all necessary deductions, payments, and
12 withholdings owed by the employer, including, but not limited to, the failure to make all
13 necessary contributions for unemployment benefits, social security benefits, proper payment of
14 taxes and withholdings, and other mandated state and federal benefits.

15 97. Plaintiff has also been injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt
16 to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the
17 mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

18 98. Labor Code § 226(e) requires Defendants to pay the greater of all actual damages
19 or fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and
20 one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods, plus
21 attorney's fees and costs, to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass who were
22 injured by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a). The exact amount of the
23 applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

24 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION**

26 (Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*)

27 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees against All Defendants*

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

1 alleged herein.

2 100. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair
3 competition, which includes any “unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.” The
4 Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact,
5 due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

6 101. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under Business &
7 Professions Code § 17021.

8 102. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California’s wage
9 and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide
10 mandated meal periods and rest breaks, and failure to timely pay wages each period and upon
11 separation of employment, all to decrease their costs and increase their profits.

12 103. At all times relevant herein, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Represented
13 Employees wages and monies and other financial obligations to which they were entitled.

14 104. As a result of Defendants’ failure to comply with the Labor Code and IWC
15 Orders, Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, suffered a loss of wages and monies, all in
16 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. Defendants’ ongoing violations of the
17 foregoing statutes and laws constitute a violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*

18 105. Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders and
19 its scheme to lower its payroll costs as alleged herein, constitute unlawful and unfair business
20 practices because it was done in a systematic manner over a period of time to the detriment of the
21 Plaintiff and all others similarly-situated.

22 106. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
23 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
24 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
25 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

26 107. A violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* may be
27 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
28 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, are

1 unlawful and in violation of public policy, and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive,
2 fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
3 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

4 108. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has no plain,
5 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which they have suffered as a
6 consequence of Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of
7 the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
8 and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
9 harm unless Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
10 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

11 109. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is entitled to,
12 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge the profits which Defendants have
13 acquired, or of which Plaintiff and Represented Employees have been deprived, by means of the
14 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the
15 Represented Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the unfair
16 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

17 110. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
18 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
19 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining Defendants, and each of them, from
20 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in
21 the future.

22 111. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and
23 Represented Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
24 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
25 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and
26 Represented Employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil
27 Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

28 ///

1 **VI. LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CAUSES OF ACTION**
2 **(Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)**

3 112. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as she was employed by
4 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
5 violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil
6 action filed on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved
7 employees in California against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed
8 (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

9 113. Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to
10 Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by
11 PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court
12 in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Therefore, Plaintiff is not required to, nor
13 does she, seek class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

14 114. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff has provided written notice by
15 online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail
16 to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated,
17 including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

18 115. Therefore, as more than sixty-five (65) days have passed since that date, Plaintiff
19 has fully satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit under the PAGA and this Complaint
20 will be deemed amended to include the PAGA allegations enumerated below. Once this occurs,
21 Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code §
22 2699, as well as attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by PAGA through a
23 representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v.*
24 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Plaintiff is not required to, nor does he, seek class
25 certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

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

7 117. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to
8 be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each
9 hour worked.

10 118. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and
11 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
12 worked. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were
13 required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they
14 were performing.

15 119. As one specific example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were frequently
16 required to perform off-the-clock work at the beginning and end of shifts without compensation.
17 Because this time was spent under Defendants' control without compensation, this violates
18 California law and led to minimum and overtime wage violations. See *Troester v. Starbucks*
19 *Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law "do[es] not allow employers to require
20 employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without compensation"). See *Frlekin v.*
21 *Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under company's
22 control and where the tasks served the employer's interests). See also *Cadena v. Customer*
23 *Connexx LLC* (9th Cir. 2022) 51 F.4th 831 (booting up and shutting down computers is
24 compensable under the FLSA [and therefore the Labor Code]).

25 120. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
26 the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked.

27 121. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
28 wage laws, inter alia, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and Cal.

Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

122. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

123. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

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

125. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

126. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12) in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

127. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

128. As one specific example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were frequently required to perform off-the-clock work at the beginning and end of shifts without compensation. Because this time was spent under Defendants' control without compensation, this violates

California law and led to minimum and overtime wage violations. See *Troester v. Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law “do[es] not allow employers to require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without compensation”). See *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under company’s control and where the tasks served the employer’s interests). See also *Cadena v. Customer Connexx LLC* (9th Cir. 2022) 51 F.4th 831 (booting up and shutting down computers is compensable under the FLSA [and therefore the Labor Code]).

129. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked.

130. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week without proper overtime compensation.

131. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

132. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS

(Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

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

134. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal periods.

1 135. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
2 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

3 136. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
4 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
5 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
6 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
7 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
8 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
9 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

10 137. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order,
11 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
12 pay for each meal period that is missed.

13 138. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were denied
14 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
15 practices, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations
16 when they were: (1) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty
17 meal period while under the control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period,
18 (4) forced to take a meal period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated
19 second meal periods for shifts in excess of 10 hours.

20 139. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
21 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
22 all mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
23 one additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

24 140. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
25 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
26 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

3 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

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

7 142. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
8 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

9 143. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
10 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

11 144. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
12 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
13 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
14 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
15 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

16 145. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order,
17 Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay at his
18 regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

19 146. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
20 Employees with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction
21 thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the
22 Aggrieved Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks
23 due to the lack of adequate staffing and coverage and being overwhelmed by their hectic
24 workload. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked
25 longer shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit mandated third and fourth rest breaks.

26 147. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
27 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
28 all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees

one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

148. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD

(Labor Code § 204)

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

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

150. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were "nonexempt" employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the timing of payment of wages each period.

151. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of the following month.

152. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states "[t]he 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."

153. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each period within the time required by Labor Code § 204. Moreover, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums, within the time specified by Labor Code § 204.

154. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks

1 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
2 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

3 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

5 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 and 256)

6 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

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

9 156. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “non-exempt” employees
10 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
11 timing and payment of final wages.

12 157. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
13 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

14 158. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
15 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
16 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

17 159. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
18 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
19 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

20 160. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
21 Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not
22 limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums,
23 within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

24 161. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
25 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
26 due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

27 162. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
28 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,

and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

(Labor Code § 226)

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

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

164. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

165. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

166. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because due to violations including: failure to accurately state total hours worked (the wage statements failed to accurately reflect total compensable hours); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to accurately state all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay); failure to accurately state the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, failure to accurately name and list the address of the legal entity that is the employer, and; the failure to accurately state the amount and rate of pay for meal and rest break premiums under Labor Code § 226.7.

167. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to because Defendants failed to provide a wage statement to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved

1 Employees that complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

2 168. As a result of the Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff seeks
3 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
4 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.
5 See *Raines v. Coastal Pacific Food Distributors, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 667, 675 ("Section
6 226.3 provides the civil penalty for failure to comply" with Labor Code § 226).

7 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, on a representative basis, and all others
9 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
10 follows:

- 11 1. That the First through Seventh Causes of Action be certified as a class action;
- 12 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;
- 13 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;
- 14 4. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Seventh
15 Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and
16 Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
- 17 5. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by
18 law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;
- 19 6. For injunctive relief and/or restitution as provided by the Labor Code and
20 Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;
- 21 7. As to the Eighth through Fourteenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all
22 applicable and available remedies under the PAGA;
- 23 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under the PAGA;
- 24 9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200,
25 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1198,
26 and 1199, among other sections inadvertently omitted;
- 27 10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
28 not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties according to proof, including interest

thereon;

11. For pre- and post-judgment interest; and

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby demands a jury trial as to the First through Seventh Causes of Action pled herein.

Dated: June ___, 2023

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

BY: _____

Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
Kristina Bui Carlson, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

PROOF OF SERVICE
(Pursuant to CCP §§ 1013(a)(1) and 2015.5)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

I am employed in the County of Riverside, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513, Riverside, CA 92504.

On July 21, 2023, I caused to be served the foregoing document(s) described as follows:

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

I declare that I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with the U.S. postal service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ **By Mail** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Riverside, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

☐ **By Facsimile** I sent this document via fax to all parties as listed on attached service list, on

☐ **By Overnight Service** I deposited such envelope in a facility regularly maintained by the United Parcel Service for receipt of items for overnight delivery, with overnight delivery expenses prepaid, addressed to the person to be served.

☒ **By Email or Electronic Transmission:** Pursuant to CCP § 1010.6 or an agreement of the parties to accept service by email or electronic transmission, I caused the document(s) to be sent from email address tracie@lmlfirm.com to the persons at the electronic notification address listed in the service list. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was not successful.

☐ **By Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested** I caused such envelope with postage fully prepaid thereon, to be placed in the United States mail at Riverside, California

☐ **By Personal Service** I caused said document(s) to be personally served by hand on the parties listed on the attached service list.

☒ **State** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on July 21, 2023, Riverside, California.

☐ **Federal** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.


Tracie Chiarito, Declarant

SERVICE LIST

Brian D. Martin, Esq.
Geoffrey D. LaVal, Esq.
ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO
4275 Executive Square, #700
La Jolla, CA 92037-1477
858-485-9526
858-485-9412-fax
brian.martin@aalrr.com
geoffrey.laval@aalrr.com
Attorneys for Defendant
