

**COPY**

**FILED**  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

**JUN 08 2023**

  
BY: Michelle Gomez-Casillas, 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  
9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100  
Irvine, California 92618  
Telephone: (949) 379-6250  
Facsimile: (949) 379-6251  
Email: [jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com](mailto:jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff Eurico A Mancilla, individually,  
and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

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

EURICO A MANCILLA, individually and  
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

OWENS & MINOR DISTRIBUTION,  
INC.; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. **CIV SB 2313354**

**COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Enforcement of Labor Code § 2698 et seq.  
("PAGA")

1 Plaintiff Eurico A Mancilla, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,  
2 alleges as follows:

3 **NATURE OF ACTION AND INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff Eurico A Mancilla (“Plaintiff”) brings this representative action pursuant  
5 to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code. § 2698 et seq., against defendants  
6 Owens & Minor Distribution, Inc., and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive (collectively,  
7 “Defendants”), on Plaintiff’s own behalf and on behalf of persons who are and were employed  
8 by Defendants as non-exempt employees throughout 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;
- 22 (f) failing to pay wages timely during employment; and
- 23 (g) failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.

24 5. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of Plaintiff and all  
25 others similarly situated in California to recover, among other things, civil penalties, attorneys’  
26 fees, and costs, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510,  
27 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2800, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and Code  
28 of California Civil 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 aggrieved employees.

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.

## GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

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

19. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein 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 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
4 should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved employees were entitled to receive wages for all  
5 time worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages) and that they were not receiving  
6 all wages earned for work that was required to be performed. In violation of the Labor Code and  
7 IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Aggrieved employees were not paid all wages (including  
8 minimum wages and overtime wages) for all hours worked at the correct rate and within the  
9 correct time.

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

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

24 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
25 should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved employees were entitled to reimbursement  
26 and/or indemnification for all necessary business expenditures or losses as a direct consequence  
27 of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants. In violation  
28 of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Aggrieved employees incurred necessary

1 business expenses or losses, but were not reimbursed nor indemnified of such expenses or losses  
2 that were incurred as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience  
3 to the directions of Defendants.

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

17 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or  
18 should have known that the aggrieved employees were entitled to timely payment of wages due  
19 upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, the aggrieved employees did not  
20 receive payment of all wages within the permissible time periods.

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

25 28. Therefore, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking civil penalties against Defendants  
26 for, among other things, unpaid wages (including minimum wages and overtime wages), unpaid  
27 meal period premium payments, unpaid rest period premium payments, unreimbursed business  
28 expenditures.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **ENFORCEMENT OF LABOR CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ. ("PAGA")**

3 29. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporate by reference the previous paragraphs  
4 as though fully set forth herein.

5 30. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that provides  
6 for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development  
7 Agency ("LWDA") or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or  
8 employees for violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil  
9 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or  
10 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code § 2699.3.

11 31. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is  
12 specifically provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred  
13 dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two  
14 hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent pay  
15 period in which Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

16 32. Defendants' conduct violates numerous Wage Order and Labor Code sections,  
17 including, but not limited to, the following:

- 18 a. violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 246, 510, 1182.12,  
19 1194, 1197, and 1198 for failure to timely pay all wages at the correct  
20 rate of pay (including minimum wage, sick pay, and overtime wages)  
21 owed to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees during employment and  
22 upon separation of employment as herein alleged;
- 23 b. violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal  
24 periods to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay  
25 premium wages for missed meal periods as herein alleged;
- 26 c. violation of Labor Code § 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to  
27 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium  
28 wages for missed rest periods as herein alleged;

- 1 d. violation of Labor Code § 226 for failure to provide accurate itemized  
2 wage statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein  
3 alleged;
- 4 e. violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain  
5 accurate and complete records showing, among other things, the hours  
6 worked daily by and the wages paid to aggrieved employees; and
- 7 f. violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse  
8 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for necessary business expenses  
9 as herein alleged.

10 33. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” because he was employed by the alleged  
11 violator and had one or more of the violations committed against him, and therefore is properly  
12 suited to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

13 34. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code § 2699.3  
14 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself and  
15 all other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

16 35. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to  
17 recover civil penalties, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code sections  
18 cited above.

19 36. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney’s fees and costs incurred  
20 herein.

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 24 1. For civil penalties;
- 25 2. For reasonable attorneys’ fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted  
26 by law, including, but not limited to, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and Labor Code §§ 2698  
27 *et seq.*; and

28 ///

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

Dated: June 8, 2023

**AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC**

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jessica L. Campbell  
Attorneys for Plaintiff Eurico A Mancilla