

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION ONLY TO:

<https://dir.tfaforms.net/128> (copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Warner Bros. Studio Operations, A Division of WB Studio Enterprises, Inc.
30 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5841 2213 07

CT Corporation, Agent for Service
Warner Bros. Studio Operations, A Division of WB Studio Enterprises, Inc.
330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5841 2210 93

Warner Bros. Discovery
100 California Street
Burbank, CA 91505
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5841 2214 20

WARNERMEDIA
100 California Street
Burbank, CA 91505
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5841 2592 56

Warner Bros. Studio Facilities
100 California Street
Burbank, CA 91505
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5841 2598 50

**Re: Labor Code § 2698, et seq. Penalties – PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA
*Padilla v. Warner Bros. Studio Operations, A Division of WB Studio Enterprises, Inc.,
et al.***

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiff Jennifer Leiva Padilla (“Plaintiff”) and other similarly situated aggrieved non-exempt employees excepting custodian workers (collectively “Aggrieved Employees”) for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698,



2699, *et seq.* and 2802; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et. seq.* (“the Act”). Plaintiff would like to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendants, Warner Bros. Studio Operations, A Division of WB Studio Enterprises, Inc.; Warner Bros. Discovery; WARNERMEDIA; Warner Bros. Studio Facilities; and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as “Defendants”).

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act, along with a copy of Plaintiff’s Class Action Complaint, which is attached to this Notice letter. The Complaint is being concurrently filed in Los Angeles Superior Court and will be assigned a local case number. The Complaint allegations and claims are incorporated into this Notice Letter.

We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. The attached Class Action Complaint provides the details of Plaintiff’s class-wide claims and claims under the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It, along with this Notice Letter, addresses in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Aggrieved Employees were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees excepting custodian workers within the state of California within the statutory time period who suffer or suffered from the same wage and hour violations outlined below. Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked.

Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were not paid for the time that they worked “pre-shift” and “post-shift” without compensation by going through security checks, going through COVID-screening temperature checks, and donning and doffing uniforms before clocking in and after clocking out. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages due and owing because Defendants failed to pay on-call or standby pay. Defendants required Plaintiff and to call in to see if she was scheduled to work the same day or next day. During this time, Plaintiff was under Defendant’s control because she would then have to report to work. Upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were also required to be on-call and were not compensated for on-call or standby pay. Thus, Aggrieved Employees were required to work hours, under the control of Defendants, without wages.

Defendants also used a time-keeping system that allowed Aggrieved Employees to keep track of the hours they worked. However, instead of having Aggrieved Employees record the times they actually started and stopped working, Defendants had a uniform policy and practice of rounding



all time entries to reflect scheduled start and end times rather than paying Aggrieved Employees for all hours and minutes they actually worked. This practice of rounding all time entries was generally done to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees, and these unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created.

Because of the foregoing understatement of hours worked, Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees proper overtime wages. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees consistently worked in excess of eight (8) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week. However, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above, was worked by Aggrieved Employees in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

Additionally, Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of denying Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees proper meal periods. Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work through their meal periods which they were consistently denied. Furthermore, Defendants had a consistent policy and practice of rounding time entries to reflect scheduled meal period times rather than recording the times meal periods were actually taken, and such rounding was done to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees in that it resulted in timekeeping entries that did not account for all of the hours and minutes actually worked by Aggrieved Employees. Also, what meal periods Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees did take, were consistently less than 30 minutes, taken well after their fifth consecutive hour of work, and were on-duty due to Defendants' policy and practice of interrupting meal breaks with work demands and requiring Aggrieved Employees to keep radios and work phones on during meal periods to respond to emergencies and other situations, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. Similarly, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work in excess of ten (10) hours a day, without ever receiving a second meal compliant period, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than 10 minutes for every work period of 4 or more consecutive hours, as required by Labor Code. Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work through their rest breaks which they were continuously denied. What rest breaks were taken were on-duty due to Defendants' policy and practice of interrupting rest breaks with work demands and requiring Aggrieved Employees to keep radios and work phones on during rest breaks to respond to emergencies and other situations.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures incurred in execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Defendants have failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their job duties for Defendants, including the cost of mileage when employees drove personal vehicles for work purposes, personal cellphone



usage, and COVID tests and protective equipment such as face masks and hand sanitizer which were required by Defendants, all of which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ.

Defendants consistently failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226(a). Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. The wage statements provided to Aggrieved Employees were confusing and required Aggrieved Employees to refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct, potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Aggrieved Employees. Moreover, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages, overtime, premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks, and total hours worked due to rounding as discussed above.

Moreover, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees all wages owed at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation as required by Labor Code §§ 201-203. Defendants also consistently failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages due on a semi-monthly basis.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above and in further detail in the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states, "[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful." The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.

In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines "Hours Worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states: "The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful." The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: "Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a



lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit."

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants' unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.

Defendants thus failed to pay Employees minimum wages they were owed, including by their consistent policy of failing to pay Employees for all hours worked. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were not paid for the time that they worked, including as alleged above in connection with working during meal breaks, rounding of timekeeping entries, and working "pre-shift" and "post-shift" without compensation by going through security checks, going through COVID screenings, and donning and doffing uniforms before clocking in and after clocking out. Thus, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work hours without wages. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all minimum wages due and owing because Defendants failed to pay on-call or standby pay. Defendants required Plaintiff to call to see if she was needed at work. Plaintiff then had to report to work and was not paid on-call or standby pay. Upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were also required to be on-call and were not compensated for on-call or standby pay. Additionally, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked. Defendants have the ability to pay minimum wages for all time worked and have willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees. In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated



Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime. Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees consistently worked in excess of eight (8) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week. However, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above including the time they worked "pre-shift" and "post-shift" without compensation by going through security checks, going through COVID screenings, failing to pay on-call or standby pay, donning and doffing uniforms, and time spent working while clocked out for meal breaks caused Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code § 510 and applicable Wage Orders.

Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above and by under-reporting actual hours worked. This unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours or twelve hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Aggrieved Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Aggrieved Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Aggrieved Employees' detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring Plaintiff and



other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Aggrieved Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions. Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty minutes as required under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and paragraph 11 of the applicable Wage Orders. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were forced to incur shortened meal periods, were provided with meal periods late and well after the fifth hour of work, could not be relieved to take their meal periods, or were required to remain on-duty at all times and were unable to take off-duty meal periods or were otherwise not provided with the opportunity to take required meal periods.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees were provided with a meal period, it was often untimely or interrupted by having to respond to work demands or remain under Defendants' control due to Defendants' policy and practice requiring Aggrieved Employees to keep radios and work phones on to respond to emergencies and other situations, in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. On shifts over ten hours, second meal periods were not provided. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided. Specifically, Defendants had a uniform policy and practice of rounding time entries to reflect scheduled meal period times rather than recording the times meal periods were actually taken, and such rounding was done to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees in that it resulted in timekeeping entries that did not account for all of the hours and minutes actually worked by Aggrieved Employees. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.



Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Specifically, Defendants provided rest periods untimely or for shortened durations, and Defendants' policies and procedures required Aggrieved Employees to remain under Defendants' control during breaks by requiring Aggrieved Employees to keep radios and work phones on to respond to emergencies and other situations.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802

Defendants have consistently required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business expenses in the execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Specifically, Defendants have failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their job duties for Defendants including mileage when employees drove personal vehicles for work purposes, personal cellphone usage, and COVID tests and protective equipment such as face masks and hand sanitizer which were required by Defendants, all of which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ in violation of Labor Code § 2802. Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work-related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC



Wage Orders, and Plaintiff seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees, by Defendants, failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks, and reflected incorrect hours worked due to the rounding of timekeeping entries. Additionally, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees, by Defendants, failed to include the above requirements enumerated above. Aggrieved Employees' wage statements did not include: the total hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and failed to accurately set forth all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each such rate in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9). The wage statements provided to Aggrieved Employees were confusing and required Aggrieved Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Aggrieved Employees.

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More



specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to “a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...”

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants’ systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code § 204 and § 226.

Given the above described off the clock work, Plaintiff was not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours she worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and was not paid all double time owed either. Defendants’ uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, by unlawful rounding and off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or



termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, premium pay, etc., and by not properly recording meal period start and end times, all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination or within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).



Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

Plaintiff's PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 et seq. and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.* and 2802, including as follows:

(a) **Wage Claims:** For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(b) **Meal and Rest Period Claims:** For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) **Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records:** For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and



paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...";

(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5, and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

We have been constrained to initially move forward with the filing of this Complaint, alleging the causes of action discussed herein, without the PAGA claim. Thus, any action by the LWDA would not resolve the entirety of the case, and the interest of judicial economy will be served by allowing the case to proceed as a cohesive whole.

This letter and the attached Complaint therefore provide the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Warner Bros. Studio Operations, A Division of WB Studio Enterprises, Inc., Warner Bros. Discovery, WARNERMEDIA, Warner Bros. Studio Facilities, and any other named Defendants and joint employers. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether Plaintiff and the



Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

Mason Doidge

Cc: Warner Bros. Studio Operations, A Division of WB Studio Enterprises, Inc., Warner Bros. Discovery, WARNERMEDIA, and Warner Bros. Studio Facilities by Certified Mail

D.LAW, INC.
Roman Shkodnik (SBN 285152)
r.shkodnik@d.law
Mason Doidge (SBN 352604)
m.doidge@d.law
450 N Brand Blvd., Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff JENNIFER LEIVA PADILLA,
on behalf of herself and others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JENNIFER LEIVA PADILLA, on behalf of
herself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

WARNER BROS. STUDIO OPERATIONS, A
DIVISION OF WB STUDIO ENTERPRISES
INC., a Delaware corporation; WARNER
BROS. DISCOVERY, an entity of unknown
form; WARNERMEDIA, an entity of
unknown form; WARNER BROS. STUDIO
FACILITIES, an entity of unknown form; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.

CLASS ACTION

Assigned for All Purposes To:

Hon.

Dept.:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
2. Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Under Labor Code § 510;
3. Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
4. Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
5. Reimbursement of Necessary Expenditures Under Labor Code § 2802;
6. Violation of Labor Code § 226(a);
7. Failure to Keep Required Payroll Records Under Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5
8. Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203; and
9. Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff JENNIFER LEIVA PADILLA, (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) on behalf of herself and
2 all others similarly situated (collectively, “Employees”; individually, “Employee”) complains of
3 Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

4 INTRODUCTION

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all current and former
6 Employees within the State of California who, at any time four (4) years prior to the filing of this
7 lawsuit, are or were employed as non-exempt, hourly employees excepting custodian workers by
8 Defendants WARNER BROS. STUDIO OPERATIONS, A DIVISION OF WB STUDIO
9 ENTERPRISES INC., a Delaware corporation; WARNER BROS. DISCOVERY, an entity of
10 unknown form; WARNERMEDIA, an entity of unknown form; WARNER BROS. STUDIO
11 FACILITIES, an entity of unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50 (all defendants being
12 collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”). Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of
13 them, violated various provisions of the California Labor Code, relevant orders of the Industrial
14 Welfare Commission (IWC) and California Business & Professions Code, and seeks redress
15 therefore.

16 2. Plaintiff is a resident of California and during the time period relevant to this
17 Complaint was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee within the State of
18 California at Defendants’ facilities and offices in California. Plaintiff and the other Class members
19 worked for Defendants in Los Angeles County, and in other nonexempt positions, throughout
20 California and, and consistently worked at Defendants’ behest without being paid all wages due.
21 More specifically, Plaintiff and the other similarly situated Class members were employed by
22 Defendants and worked at Defendants’ offices and other facilities where the conduct giving rise to
23 the allegations in this Class Action Complaint occurred. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff
24 was employed by Defendants and (1) shared similar job duties and responsibilities, (2) was
25 subjected to the same policies and practices, and (3) endured similar violations at the hands of
26 Defendants as the other Employee Class members who served in similar and related positions.

27 3. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Employees in the Class to perform work
28 while remaining under Defendants’ control before and after being on the clock for their daily work

1 shift. Defendants further failed to accurately record time worked by Plaintiff and Employee Class
2 members by rounding hours worked to reflect scheduled shift start and end times as opposed to
3 actual hours worked. Defendants thus failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class members for all hours
4 worked and provided them with inaccurate wage statements that prevented Plaintiff and the Class
5 from learning of these unlawful pay practices. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the
6 Class with lawful meal and rest periods, as employees were not provided with the opportunity to
7 take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal and rest periods as required by the Labor Code.

8 **THE PARTIES**

9 **A. The Plaintiff**

10 4. Plaintiff JENNIFER LEIVA PADILLA has resided in California and during the
11 time period relevant to this Complaint was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly
12 employee within the State of California.

13 **B. The Defendants**

14 5. Defendant WARNER BROS. STUDIO OPERATIONS, A DIVISION OF WB
15 STUDIO ENTERPRISES INC. is a Delaware corporation with its principle executive offices in
16 Burbank, California and has been listed as the employer on Plaintiff's paystubs during the relevant
17 time period. WARNER BROS. STUDIO OPERATIONS, A DIVISION OF WB STUDIO
18 ENTERPRISES INC. lists a New York mailing address with the California Secretary of State and
19 employs Plaintiff and the Class members at Defendants' offices and facilities in Burbank,
20 California, and throughout California and conducts business throughout California.

21 6. Defendant WARNER BROS. DISCOVERY, is a an entity of unknown form
22 with its principle executive offices in Burbank, California and has been listed as the employer on
23 Plaintiff's personnel file during the relevant time period. WARNER BROS. DISCOVERY does
24 not list a California address with the California Secretary of State, but upon information and
25 belief, employs Plaintiff and the Employees in Los Angeles County, including at Defendants'
26 offices and facilities in Burbank, California, and throughout California and conducts business
27 throughout California.

28 7. Defendant WARNERMEDIA is an entity of unknown form with its principle

1 executive offices in Burbank, California and has been listed as the employer on Plaintiff's
2 employment documents during the relevant time period. WARNERMEDIA does not list a mailing
3 address with the California Secretary of State and employs Plaintiff and the Class members at
4 Defendants' offices and facilities in Burbank, California, and throughout California and conducts
5 business throughout California.

6 8. Defendant WARNER BROS. STUDIO FACILITIES is an entity of unknown form
7 with its principle executive offices in Burbank, California and has been listed as the employer on
8 Plaintiff's employment documents during the relevant time period. WARNER BROS. STUDIO
9 FACILITIES does not list a mailing address with the California Secretary of State and employs
10 Plaintiff and the Class members at Defendants' offices and facilities in Burbank, California, and
11 throughout California and conducts business throughout California.

12 9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
13 whatever else, of the Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are currently
14 unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of
15 Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
16 designated herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, are legally responsible in
17 some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend
18 this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated herein as
19 Does 1 through 50 when their identities become known.

20 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted in
21 all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, that Defendants carried
22 out a joint scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and that the acts of
23 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants acted in
24 all respects as the employers or joint employers of Employees. Defendants, and each of them,
25 exercised control over the wages, hours or working conditions of Employees, or suffered or
26 permitted Employees to work, or engaged, thereby creating a common law employment
27 relationship, with Employees. Therefore, Defendants, and each of them, employed or jointly
28 employed Employees.

- 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

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

1 statements and payroll checks were created. Plaintiff also contends that Defendants failed to pay
2 Plaintiff and the Class members all wages due and owing, failed to provide meal and rest breaks,
3 and failed to furnish accurate wage statements, all in violation of various provisions of the
4 California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

5 13. During the course of Plaintiff and the Class members' employment with
6 Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed and
7 for all overtime hours worked and were forced to work during their meal and rest breaks.
8 Defendants also failed to maintain timekeeping records for Plaintiff that would permit her to
9 discover the nature and extent of Defendants' unlawful rounding.

10 14. As a matter of uniform Company policy, Plaintiff and the Class members were
11 required to work during their meal and rest breaks which were not compensated by Defendants in
12 violation of the California Labor Code. Plaintiff and the Class members were also not paid
13 regular wages and overtime for the time they were required to comply with other requirements
14 imposed upon them, which they had to complete while working through their meal and rest
15 breaks and without compensation. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class members worked shifts over
16 eight (8) hours in a day and over forty (40) hours in a work week, but they were not paid at the
17 appropriate overtime rate for all such hours, including by being required to perform work duties
18 and tasks without pay and while off-the-clock, and due to Defendants' unlawful rounding. As a
19 result, Plaintiff and the Class members worked substantial overtime hours during their
20 employment with Defendants for which they were not compensated, in violation of the California
21 Labor Code, applicable IWC Wage Orders.

22 15. As a result of the above described unlawful rounding, the daily work demands and
23 pressures to work through breaks, and the other wage violations they endured at Defendants'
24 hands, Plaintiff and the Class members were not properly paid for all wages earned and for all
25 wages owed to them by Defendants, including when working more than eight (8) hours in any
26 given day and/or more than forty (40) hours in any given week. As a result of Defendants'
27 unlawful policies and practices, Plaintiff and Class members incurred overtime hours worked for
28 which they were not adequately and completely compensated. To the extent applicable,

1 Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class members at an overtime rate of 1.5 times the
2 regular rate for the first eight hours of the seventh consecutive work day in a week and overtime
3 payments at the rate of 2 times the regular rate for hours worked over eight (8) on the seventh
4 consecutive work day, as required under the Labor Code, applicable IWC Wage Orders.

5 16. Therefore, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
6 continuing to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay
7 Employees for all hours worked and failing to pay minimum wage for all time worked as required
8 by California Law.

9 17. Additionally from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
10 continuing to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay
11 Employees overtime compensation at premium overtime rates for all hours worked in excess of
12 eight (8) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, and double-time rates for all hours worked in
13 excess of twelve (12) hours a day, in violation of Labor Code § 510 and the corresponding
14 sections of IWC Wage Orders.

15 18. Additionally from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
16 continuing to the present, Defendants have regularly required Employees to work shifts in excess
17 of five (5) hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty
18 (30) minutes and shifts in excess of ten (10) hours without providing them with second meal
19 periods of not less than thirty minutes; nor did Defendants pay Employees “premium pay,” i.e. one
20 hour of wages at each Employee’s effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that
21 Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

22 19. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
23 present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with paid rest breaks of not less
24 than ten (10) minutes for every work period of four (4) or more consecutive hours; nor did
25 Defendants pay Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not
26 provided or were deficiently provided at one hour of wages at each Employee’s effective regular
27 rate of pay, for each rest period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

28 20. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and

1 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with timely,
2 accurate, and itemized wage statements as required by California wage-and-hour laws.
3 Specifically, the wage statements given to Employees by Defendants failed to accurately account
4 for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficient meal periods and rest breaks all of which
5 Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to Employees, as alleged
6 hereinabove. The wage statements provided to Employees were confusing and required
7 Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was
8 correct, potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Employees.

9 21. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and
10 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with timely,
11 accurate, and itemized wage statements, in writing, as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

12 22. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
13 present, Defendants have failed to reimburse Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the
14 performance of their job duties for Defendants including, but not limited to, the cost of mileage
15 when employees drove personal vehicles for work purposes, personal cellphone usage, and
16 COVID tests and protective equipment such as face masks and hand sanitizer which were required
17 by Defendants, all of which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ in
18 violation of Labor Code § 2802.

19 23. Additionally, from at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and
20 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to keep accurate time and wage
21 records as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

22 24. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to filing this lawsuit and continuing
23 to the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages due and owed to
24 Employees at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as
25 required by California wage-and-hour laws.

26 25. In light of the foregoing, Employees bring this action pursuant to, inter alia, Labor
27 Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12,
28 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1199, and 2802.

26. Furthermore, pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-17208, Employees seek injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendants have enjoyed from their violations of Labor Code.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

27. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class defined as follows: all individuals employed by Defendants within the State of California at any time within four (4) years of the filing of this lawsuit.

28. Further, Plaintiff seeks to represent the following Subclasses composed of and defined as follows:

a. Subclass 1. Minimum Wages Subclass. All Class members who were not compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the applicable minimum wage.

b. Subclass 2. Wages and Overtime Subclass. All Class members who were not compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the required rates of pay, including for all hours worked in excess of eight in a day and/or forty in a week.

c. Subclass 3. Meal Period Subclass. All Class members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to provide unpaid 30-minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal periods or one hour of pay at the Employee's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

d. Subclass 4. Rest Break Subclass. All Class members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to authorize and permit Employees to take uninterrupted, duty-free, 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof, and failing to pay one hour of pay at the Employee's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

e. Subclass 5. Payroll Records Subclass. All Class members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to keep accurate time and wage records as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

f. Subclass 6. Wage Statement Subclass. All Class members who, within the applicable limitations period, were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

g. Subclass 7. Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures. All Class

members who were subject to Defendants' failure to reimburse for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of Employees job duties for Defendants.

h. Subclass 8. Termination Pay Subclass. All Class members who, within the applicable limitations period, either voluntarily or involuntarily separated from their employment and were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to timely pay wages upon termination.

i. Subclass 9. UCL Subclass. All Class members who are owed restitution as a result of Defendants' business acts and practices, to the extent such acts and practices are found to be unlawful, deceptive, and/or unfair.

29. Plaintiff reserves the right under California Rule of Court 3.765 to amend or modify the class description with greater particularity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues.

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

A. Numerosity

31. The potential members of the class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all the member of the class is impracticable. While the precise number of class members has not been determined at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants employ or, during the time period relevant to this lawsuit, employed more than 100 individuals within the State of California.

32. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant time period increases this number substantially. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' employment records will provide information as to the number and location of all class members.

B. Commonality

33. There are questions of law and fact common to the class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members. These common questions of law and fact include:

- a. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees minimum wages;
- b. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees wages for all hours worked;
- c. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees overtime as required under Labor Code § 510;
- d. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, by failing to provide Employees with requisite meal periods or premium pay in lieu thereof;
- e. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, by failing to provide Employees with requisite rest breaks or premium pay in lieu thereof;
- f. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226(a);
- g. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5;
- h. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Employees for necessary business expenses;
- i. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by failing to pay wages and compensation due and owing at the time of termination of employment;
- j. Whether Defendants violated Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; and
- k. Whether Employees are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

C. Typicality

34. The claims of the named plaintiff are typical of those of the other Employees. Employees all sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of statutes, as well as regulations that have the force and effect of law, as alleged herein.

D. Adequacy of Representation

35. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of Employees. Counsel who represents Employees are experienced and competent in litigating employment class actions.

1 **E. Superiority of Class Action**

2 36. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient
3 adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Employees is not practicable, and
4 questions of law and fact common to all Employees predominate over any questions affecting only
5 individual Employees. Each Employee has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of
6 Defendants' illegal policies or practices of failing to compensate Employees properly.

7 37. Class action treatment will allow those persons similarly situated to litigate their
8 claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.
9 Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties in managing this case that should preclude class action.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 38. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
14 full herein.

15 39. Defendants failed to pay Employees minimum wages for all hours worked.
16 Defendants had a consistent policy of misstating Employees time records and failing to pay
17 Employees for all hours worked. Employees would work hours and not receive wages, including
18 as alleged above in connection with working during meal breaks, rounding of timekeeping
19 entries, and working "pre-shift" and "post-shift" without compensation by going through security
20 checks, going through COVID screening checks, and donning and doffing uniforms before
21 clocking in and after clocking out. Defendants also failed to pay for on-call or standby time.
22 Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff to call to see if she was needed at work. Plaintiff then
23 had to report to work and was not paid on-call or standby pay. Upon information and belief,
24 Class members were also required to be on-call and were not compensated for on-call or standby
25 pay. Additionally, Defendants had a consistent policy of failing to pay Employees for hours
26 worked during alleged meal periods for which Employees were consistently denied, as also
27 addressed herein. Defendants have also intentionally and improperly rounded, changed, adjusted,
28 and/or modified Employee hours, while benefiting Defendants. Defendants thus regularly failed

1 to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and Class members, including by unlawful rounding to their
2 detriment. Moreover, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and Employees at the applicable minimum
3 wage for all hours worked. Defendants' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices
4 manifested, without limitation, applicable to the Class as a whole, as a result of implementing a
5 uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to Plaintiff and the other members
6 of the Class as to minimum wage pay.

7 40. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage"
8 states:

9 The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the
10 minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less
11 wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

12 41. The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the
13 relevant period is found in the Wage Orders. Pursuant to the Wage Orders, Employees are
14 therefore entitled to double the minimum wage during the relevant period.

15 42. The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private
16 civil action pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a) which states:

17 Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any
18 employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
19 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to
20 recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of
21 this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest
22 thereon, reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit.

23 43. As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages
24 incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission.

25 44. California Labor Code § 1194.2 also provides for the following remedies:

26 In any action under Section 1194 . . . to recover wages because of
27 the payment of a wage less than the minimum wages fixed by an
28 order of the commission, an employee shall be entitled to recover
liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
unpaid and interest thereon.

45. Defendants have the ability to pay minimum wages for all time worked and have
willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this
indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Employees.

1 46. Wherefore, Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages
2 (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum
3 wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant
4 to California Labor Code § 1194(a).

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES AND OVERTIME UNDER LABOR CODE § 510**

7 **(Against All Defendants)**

8 47. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
9 full herein.

10 48. By their conduct, as set forth herein, Defendants violated California Labor Code §
11 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees:
12 (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a
13 workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any workweek or for the first eight (8) hours worked
14 on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours
15 worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any one (1) day or for hours worked in excess of eight
16 (8) hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not
17 paying Employees wages for all hours worked including time off the clock working "pre-shift"
18 and "post-shift" without compensation by going through security checks, going through COVID
19 screening checks, and donning and doffing uniforms before clocking in and after clocking out.
20 Defendants also failed to pay for on-call or standby time. Specifically, Defendants required
21 Plaintiff to call to see if she was needed at work. Plaintiff then had to report to work and was not
22 paid on-call or standby pay. Upon information and belief, Class members were also required to
23 be on-call and were not compensated for on-call or standby pay. Employees regularly worked
24 over 8 hours on a given day or over 40 hours in a given week without receiving overtime
25 compensation.

26 49. Defendants' failure to pay compensation in a timely fashion also constituted a
27 violation of California Labor Code § 204, which requires that all wages shall be paid
28 semimonthly. From four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit to the present, in direct

1 violation of that provision of the California Labor Code, Defendants have failed to pay all wages
2 and overtime compensation earned by Employees. Each such failure to make a timely payment of
3 compensation to Employees constitutes a separate violation of California Labor Code § 204.

4 50. Employees have been damaged by these violations of California Labor Code §§
5 204 and 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission).

6 51. Consequently, pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 204, 510, and 1194 (and the
7 relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission), Defendants are liable to Employees for
8 the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their
9 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **MEAL-PERIOD LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 52. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
14 full herein.

15 53. Employees regularly worked shifts greater than five (5) hours and greater than ten
16 (10) hours. Pursuant to Labor Code § 512 an employer may not employ someone for a shift of
17 more than five (5) hours without providing him or her with a meal period of not less than thirty
18 (30) minutes or for a shift of more than ten (10) hours without providing him or her with a second
19 meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

20 54. Defendants failed to provide Employees with meal periods as required under the
21 Labor Code. Employees were consistently required to work through their meal periods which they
22 were consistently denied. Employees were also required to take meal periods after working well
23 beyond the five (5) hour shifts. In addition, Defendants had a consistent policy and practice of
24 rounding time entries to reflect scheduled meal period times rather than recording the times meal
25 periods were actually taken, and such rounding was done to the detriment of Employees in that it
26 resulted in timekeeping entries that did not account for all of the hours and minutes actually
27 worked by Employees. What meal periods were provided were also not duty-free due to
28 Defendants' policy and practice of interrupting the meal breaks with work demands and requiring

1 Employees to keep radios and work phones on during meal periods to respond to emergencies and
2 other situations. Furthermore, Employees were regularly required to work for more than 10 hours
3 in a given shift without receiving a second uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period as
4 required by law.

5 55. Moreover, Defendants failed to compensate Employees for each meal period not
6 provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and
7 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, which provide that, if an employer fails to provide an
8 employee a meal period in accordance with this section, the employer shall pay the employee one
9 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period
10 is not provided. Defendants failed to compensate the Employees in the Class for each meal period
11 not provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11
12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

13 56. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Employees are entitled to damages in
14 an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at their effective hourly rates of pay for each meal
15 period not provided or deficiently provided, a sum to be proven at trial.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **REST-BREAK LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

18 **(Against All Defendants)**

19 57. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
20 full herein.

21 58. Employees consistently worked consecutive four (4) hour shifts. Pursuant to the
22 Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order, Employees were entitled to paid rest breaks of
23 not less than ten (10) minutes for each consecutive four (4) hour shift.

24 59. Defendants failed to provide Employees with timely rest breaks of not less than ten
25 (10) minutes for each consecutive four (4) hour shift. What rest breaks were provided were also
26 not duty-free due to Defendants' policy and practice of interrupting rest breaks with work
27 demands and requiring Employees to keep radios and work phones on during rest breaks to
28 respond to emergencies and other situations.

1 60. Moreover, Defendants failed to compensate Employees for each rest period not
2 provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC
3 Wage Orders, which provide that, if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in
4 accordance with this section, the employer shall pay the employee one hour of pay at the
5 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.
6 Defendants failed to compensate the Employees in the Class for each rest period not provided or
7 inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage
8 Order.

9 61. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Employees are entitled to damages in
10 an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at their effective hourly rates of pay for each day
11 worked without the required rest breaks, a sum to be proven at trial.

12 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
13 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENDITURES**
14 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2802**
15 **(Against All Defendants)**

16 62. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
17 full herein.

18 63. Under Labor Code § 2802(a), an employer must indemnify its employees for all
19 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge
20 of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

21 64. Employees incurred necessary expenditures in the performance of their job duties
22 for Defendants, including, but not limited to, the cost of mileage when employees drove personal
23 vehicles for work purposes, personal cellphone usage, and COVID tests and protective equipment
24 such as face masks and hand sanitizer which were required by Defendants, all of which were
25 necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ. From four (4) years prior to the
26 original filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the present, Defendants consistently failed to
27 reimburse Employees for these necessarily incurred business expenses.

28 65. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Employees have been deprived of

1 reimbursement in amounts to be determined at trial; they are entitled to recovery of such amounts,
2 plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs.

3 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
4 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226(a)**
5 **(Against All Defendants)**

6 66. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
7 full herein.

8 67. California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each of his or her
9 employees with an accurate, itemized statement in writing showing the gross and net earnings,
10 total hours worked, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; these
11 statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else
12 serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these
13 statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the
14 employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid.

15 68. Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in
16 writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, the wage statements given to Employees, by
17 Defendants, failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficient meal
18 periods and rest breaks, and reflected incorrect hours worked due to the rounding of timekeeping
19 entries all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to Employees,
20 as alleged hereinabove. Additionally, the wage statements given to Employees, by Defendants,
21 failed to include the above requirements enumerated above. Employees' wage statements did not
22 include: the total hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and failed to accurately set
23 forth all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
24 hours worked at each such rate in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9). The wage statements
25 provided to Employees were confusing and required Employees to engage in discovery and refer
26 to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct, potentially resulting in a miscalculation
27 by the Employees.

28 69. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a),

1 Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received
2 all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and
3 forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact
4 compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

5 70. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e), Employees are entitled to recover
6 the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation
7 occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not
8 exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an
9 award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

10 71. With respect to violations of Labor Code § 226, Labor Code § 226.3 imposes a
11 civil penalty of two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for initial violations for each employee for
12 each pay period, and one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each subsequent violation for each
13 employee for each pay period.

14 72. Plaintiff is seeking penalties against Defendants under Labor Code § 226.3, and
15 any other applicable statute allowing recovery of penalties as alleged herein in an amount to be
16 shown according to proof.

17 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **FAILURE TO KEEP REQUIRED PAYROLL RECORDS UNDER LABOR CODE § 1174**

19 **AND 1174.5**

20 **(Against All Defendants)**

21 73. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
22 full herein.

23 74. California Labor Code § 1174 requires that all employers shall keep accurate time
24 and wage records for all employees. California Labor Code § 1174.5 further requires that any
25 employee suffering injury due to a willful violation of the aforementioned obligations may seek
26 damages, including civil penalties, from the employer.

27 75. During the course of Plaintiff's and Employees' employment, Defendants
28 consistently failed to maintain accurate time and wage records for Plaintiff and Employees as

1 required by California Labor Code § 1174 by failing to pay Plaintiff and Employees proper wages,
2 overtime, and premium pay as discussed above.

3 76. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for civil penalties pursuant to the California
4 Labor Code § 1174.5. for the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

5 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
6 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 203**
7 **(Against All Defendants)**

8 77. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
9 full herein.

10 78. Numerous Employees are no longer employed by Defendants; they either quit
11 Defendants' employ or were fired therefrom.

12 79. Defendants failed to pay these Employees all wages due and certain at the time of
13 termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation.

14 80. The wages withheld from these Employees by Defendants remained due and owing
15 for more than thirty (30) days from the date of separation of employment.

16 81. Defendants' failure to pay wages, as alleged above, was willful in that Defendants
17 knew wages to be due but failed to pay them; this violation entitles these Employees to penalties
18 under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up
19 to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

20 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
21 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 *ET SEQ.***
22 **(Against All Defendants)**

23 82. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
24 full herein.

25 83. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, Employees, and the general public, brings this claim
26 pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* The conduct of Defendants as alleged in
27 this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Employees and the
28 general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the

1 meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

2 84. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code
3 § 17204, has suffered injury, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive
4 relief, restitution, and other appropriate equitable relief.

5 85. Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* prohibits unlawful and unfair
6 business practices.

7 86. Wage-and-hour laws express fundamental public policies. Paying employees their
8 wages and overtime, providing them with meal and rest periods, etc., are fundamental public
9 policies of California. Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of this State vigorously
10 to enforce minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to
11 work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding employers and their
12 employees from competitors who lower costs to themselves by failing to comply with minimum
13 labor standards.

14 87. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct alleged
15 in this Complaint, Defendants have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated specific
16 provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business practices in
17 violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* Defendants’ conduct has deprived
18 Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, and all interested persons, of the rights, benefits, and
19 privileges guaranteed to all employees under the law.

20 88. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged hereinabove, constitutes unfair competition in
21 violation of the Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

22 89. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, by failing to pay wages and
23 overtime, failing to provide meal and rest periods, etc., either knew or in the exercise of reasonable
24 care should have known that their conduct was unlawful; therefore their conduct violates the
25 Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

26 90. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Employees have
27 been damaged, in a sum to be proven at trial.

28 91. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to engage in such

1 unlawful conduct as alleged above. Pursuant to the Business & Professions Code, this Court
2 should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be
3 necessary to prevent the use by Defendants or their agents or employees of any unlawful or
4 deceptive practice prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, including but not limited to the
5 disgorgement of such profits as may be necessary to restore Employees to the money Defendants
6 have unlawfully failed to pay.

7 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 9 1. For an order certifying this action as a class action;
- 10 2. For compensatory damages in the amount of the unpaid minimum wages for work
11 performed by Employees and unpaid overtime compensation from at least four (4) years prior to
12 the filing of this action, as may be proven;
- 13 3. For liquidated damages in the amount equal to the unpaid minimum wage and
14 interest thereon, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, according to proof;
- 15 4. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Employees
16 for each missed or deficient meal period where no premium pay was paid therefor from four (4)
17 years prior to the filing of this action, as may be proven;
- 18 5. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Employees
19 for each day requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided and where no
20 premium pay was paid therefor from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, as may
21 be proven;
- 22 6. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) for Employees, as may be proven;
- 23 7. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3, as may be proven;
- 24 8. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for all Employees who quit or were
25 fired in an amount equal to their daily wage times thirty (30) days, as may be proven;
- 26 9. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, as may be proven;
- 27 10. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code
28 § 17200 *et seq.*, including disgorgement or profits, as may be proven;

11. For compensatory damages in the amount of all previously unreimbursed business expenditures necessarily incurred by Employees in the discharge of their job duties for Defendants from four (4) years prior to the original filing of this action, as may be proven;

12. For an order enjoining Defendants and their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from acting in derogation of any rights or duties adumbrated in this Complaint;

13. For all general, special, and incidental damages as may be proven;

14. For an award of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

15. For an award providing for the payment of the costs of this suit;

16. For an award of attorneys' fees; and

17. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper and just.

DATED: November 25, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

By 
Roman Shkodnik
Mason Doidge
Attorneys for Plaintiff
JENNIFER LEIVA PADILLA
and the putative class

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands trial of her claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

DATED: November 25, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

By 
Roman Shkodnik
Mason Doidge
Attorneys for Plaintiff
JENNIFER LEIVA PADILLA
and the putative class