

CASE ATTACHMENT COVER PAGE		(ENDORSED) ELECTRONICALLY FILED BY SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Bernardino on Aug 4, 2023 <i>CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT</i> <i>Deputy Clerk: Charisse Navarro</i>
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO STREET ADDRESS: 247 West Third Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Bernardino, CA 92415 BRANCH NAME: San Bernardino Justice Center WEBSITE: http://www.sb-court.org		
ATTACHMENT NAME: Answer: First Amended Complaint		
CASE NAME: Victor Medina vs. Howard Roofing Company, Inc.		CASE NUMBER: CIVSB2312233
Please log on to www.TurboCourt.com regularly for updates		

Please staple this to your original attachment

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Peter J. Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 295611]
peter@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513
Riverside, CA 92504
Tel: (951) 320-1444 | Fax: (951) 320-1445

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

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

VICTOR MEDINA, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

HOWARD ROOFING COMPANY, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1 through
20, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: CIVSB2312233

*[Assigned to Hon. David Cohn, Dept S26, for
all purposes]*

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

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

PAGA CLAIMS

- (9) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (10) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (11) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (12) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (13) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (14) Failure to Timely Pay Wages Each
Period;
- (15) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (16) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized
Wage Statements; and
- (17) Failure to Maintain Records.

1 Plaintiff Victor Medina (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and
2 on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

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

11 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately 2020 through
12 February 2023.

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

16 4. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
17 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
18 worked. As one specific example, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required to
19 report to Defendants’ location (the “yard”) at the start of their shift, and they then drove
20 Defendants’ trucks to jobsites to deliver materials and manpower to perform their daily tasks.
21 Yet, despite that the time spent driving was clearly spent under Defendants’ direction and
22 control, Defendants did not properly compensate the Represented Employees for such drive time.
23 This violates California law because the Represented Employees were clearly performing tasks
24 for Defendants and, moreover, were “subject to [Defendants’] control” because they were
25 prevented “from using the time effectively for his or her own purposes.” *Morillion v. Royal*
26 *Packing Co.* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 575, 583. As held by the California Supreme Court, “by requiring
27 employees to take certain transportation to a work site, employers thereby subject those
28 employees to its control by determining when, where, and how they are to travel. Under the

1 definition of ‘hours worked,’ that travel time is compensable.” *Id.* at 588; *see also Oliver v.*
2 *Konica Minolta Business Solutions U.S.A., Inc.* (2020) 51 Cal.App.5th 1, 17 (“‘compulsory
3 travel time’ is compensable”).

4 5. Similarly, Defendants frequently required Plaintiff and the Represented
5 Employees to attend safety meetings at Defendants’ location, yet Defendants did not compensate
6 for such time and did not compensate for the time spent driving to the job site after such
7 meetings. These practices violate California law. This violates California law. *Troester v.*
8 *Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law “do[es] not allow employers to
9 require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without compensation”); *Frlekin v.*
10 *Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under company’s
11 control and where the tasks served the employer’s interests).

12 6. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants utilized a rounding policy and practice that
13 routinely undercompensated the Represented Employees and resulted in a net benefit to
14 Defendants and a net loss for the Represented Employees. In other words, Defendants’ rounding
15 policy is not neutral and results in systematic undercompensation for the Represented
16 Employees, in violation of California law. *See’s Candy Shops, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2012) 210
17 Cal.App.4th 889, 903 (rounding policy is illegal where it is not “neutral, both facially and as
18 applied”). Moreover, all underpayments caused by this rounding policy violate California law
19 and lead to minimum, regular, and overtime wage violations under *Camp v. Home Depot U.S.A.*
20 *Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal. App. 5th 638, 660 (if an employer “can capture and has captured the exact
21 time an employee has worked during a shift, the employer must pay the employee for ‘all the
22 time’ worked”).

23 7. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper overtime to Plaintiff and the
24 Represented Employees. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were
25 paid on an hourly basis plus additional earned nondiscretionary compensation. However, on the
26 occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees worked overtime hours and received
27 additional earned compensation during the same workweek, Defendants failed to include these
28 amounts in the calculations for the regular rate of pay – in violation of California law.

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

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

16 10. Also, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Represented Employees to incur
17 substantial business-related expenses and costs to carry out their duties for Defendants without
18 reimbursement without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
19 were required to provide their own tools to carry out their tasks for Defendants, yet Defendants
20 did not reimburse the Represented Employees for such expenses.

21 11. Plaintiff also alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
22 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
23 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
24 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
25 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
26 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, vacation and sick wages, wage premiums, among others.

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

1 13. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' violations of the wage and hour components of
2 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their
3 level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over
4 its competitors.

5 14. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
6 Represented Employees' employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees'
7 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
8 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
9 hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
10 underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

11 15. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, injunctive, equitable, and
12 monetary relief against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of himself and the Represented
13 Employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys' fees,
14 penalties, costs and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208,
15 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
16 1199, and 2802, among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the
17 right to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

18 **II. JURISDICTION**

19 16. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the
20 Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

21 **III. VENUE**

22 17. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil
23 Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in San Bernardino County and the unlawful
24 acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in San
25 Bernardino County. Furthermore, Defendants employed or employ Represented Employees in
26 San Bernardino County.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **IV. PARTIES**

2 **Plaintiff**

3 18. Plaintiff and Class Representative Victor Medina was employed by Defendants
4 from approximately 2020 through February 2023 and performed work for Defendants in San
5 Bernardino County.

6 **Defendants**

7 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Howard
8 Roofing Company, Inc. is a California corporation that maintains operations and employs the
9 Represented Employees throughout California, including San Bernardino County.

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

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

24 22. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
25 Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single
26 employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human
27 resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally,
28

Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor operations, and common ownership or financial control.

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

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

V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

25. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

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

27. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

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

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

3 29. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

4 **Meal Break Subclass**

5 All Represented Employees who worked a shift in excess of
6 5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

7 **Rest Break Subclass**

8 All Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least
9 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

10 **Unreimbursed Expense Subclass**

11 All Represented Employees who were required to incur
12 expenses to discharge their duties for Defendants without
13 reimbursement during the Relevant Time Period.

14 **Waiting Time Penalties Subclass**

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

19 **Wage Statement Penalties Subclass**

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

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

25 31. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that he
26 seeks to represent.
27
28

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

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

7 34. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which
8 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including
9 without limitation:

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

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

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

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

26 v. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
27 IWC Wage Order by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for
28 business expenses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of

1 their employer;

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

5 vii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
6 provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized
7 wage statements;

8 viii. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§
9 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest
10 breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, and
11 failure to timely pay final wages; and

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

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

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

25 37. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class
26 action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this
27 controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of
28 law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual

1 members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to
2 recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action
3 treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is
4 most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

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

8 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

9 38. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
10 as if fully alleged herein.

11 39. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement
12 to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for
13 each hour worked.

14 40. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided proper minimum and
15 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
16 worked. As a result of these policies and practices, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
17 were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known
18 they were performing.

19 41. As a result of the policies and practices described in this Complaint, Defendants
20 failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all hours worked.

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

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

27 44. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
28 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each

1 hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay
2 them in accordance thereto.

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

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

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

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

16 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

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

19 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

20 49. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
21 as if fully alleged herein.

22 50. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were employees of Defendants who did
23 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

24 51. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
25 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
26 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
27 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
28

regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12) in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

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

53. Additionally, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were paid on an hourly basis plus additional earned nondiscretionary compensation. However, on the occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees worked overtime hours and received additional earned compensation during the same workweek, Defendants failed to properly include these amounts in the calculations for the regular rate of pay – violating the well-established rule that overtime must always be paid at time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

54. As a result of the policies and practices described herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all overtime hours worked.

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

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

57. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were entitled to be paid proper overtime wages throughout the statutory period, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

58. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be

1 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
2 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

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

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

7 61. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
8 all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against
9 Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

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

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

14 62. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
15 as if fully alleged herein.

16 63. Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
17 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
18 periods.

19 64. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
20 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

21 65. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
22 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
23 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
24 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
25 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
26 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
27 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.
28

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

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

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

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

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

24 71. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
25 periods as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of
26 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
27 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
28

1 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal period was not
2 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

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

6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

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

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

10 73. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
11 as if fully alleged herein.

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

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

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

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

24 78. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
25 Break Subclass with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
26 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks for the
27 Rest Break Subclass and the Rest Break Subclass were often not authorized and/or permitted to
28 take mandated rest breaks due to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Furthermore, on

occasions when the Rest Break Subclass worked longer shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit mandated third or fourth rest breaks.

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

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

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

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES

(Labor Code § 2802)

Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass against All Defendants

83. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

84. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing reimbursement of business expenses.

1 85. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
2 expenses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to directions of their employer.

3 86. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants
4 required Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass to incur substantial business-related
5 expenses and costs without reimbursement.

6 87. At all relevant times herein, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they
7 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for expenses incurred as a
8 direct consequence of Plaintiff's employment with Defendants and/or under the direction of
9 Defendants.

10 88. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to reimburse the Unreimbursed
11 Expense Subclass, including Plaintiff, for expenses incurred while discharging duties to
12 Defendants, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

13 89. As a direct result of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 2802 and IWC Wage
14 Order § 9(B), Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass have suffered, and continue to
15 suffer, substantial losses related to such incurred expenses, expenses, and attorney's fees in
16 seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their obligations under the law, all in an amount
17 to be proved at time of trial.

18 90. Labor Code § 2802(b) states that "[a]ll awards made by a Court for
19 reimbursement of necessary expenditures" shall carry interest, at the same rate as judgments in
20 civil actions, and said interest will accrue from the date on which the employee incurred the
21 necessary expenditure or loss including, but not limited to, reasonable costs and attorney's fees
22 incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted pursuant to Labor Code § 2802. The exact
23 amount of the necessary expenditures or losses is in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

24 91. Furthermore, Labor Code § 2802(c) states that "[f]or the purposes of this section,
25 the term 'necessary expenditures or losses' shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not
26 limited to, attorney's fees incurred by the employee in enforcing the rights granted by this
27 section." Therefore, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees seek to recover the unreimbursed
28 expenses, interest on the unreimbursed expenses, and the costs and attorney's fees necessarily

1 incurred in pursuing same. The exact amount of reimbursements, interest, costs, and attorney's
2 fees will be in an amount to be proved at the time of trial.

3 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

5 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

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

7 92. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
8 as if fully alleged herein.

9 93. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
10 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing
11 and payment of wages.

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

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

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

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

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

27 99. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay all wages due and owing to the Waiting
28 Time Subclass because of the failure to pay all required sick pay wages. Labor Code § 246(l)(1)

1 provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees must be “calculated in the same manner
2 as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether
3 or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek.” Additionally, Labor Code §
4 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be “calculated by dividing the employee’s total
5 wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in the full
6 pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.” Here, Defendants only calculated and paid sick
7 pay at the base rate of pay, rather than at the rate required by Labor Code § 246, leading to
8 unpaid sick pay and violations of Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

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

15 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

17 (Labor Code § 226)

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

19 101. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
20 as if fully alleged herein.

21 102. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
22 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
23 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

24 103. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
25 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
26 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee’s name and the last four digits of his or her
27 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
28

entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

104. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass due to violations including: failure to accurately state total hours worked (for example, the wage statements failed to accurately reflect the compensable hours worked); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to accurately state all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay); failure to accurately state the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and failure to accurately identify the name and address of the legal entity of the employer.

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

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

107. Defendants' failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the calculation and rate of pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting miscalculation of wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

19 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION**

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

22 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees against All Defendants*

23 111. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
24 as if fully alleged herein.

25 112. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair
26 competition, which includes any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." The
27 Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact,
28 due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

1 113. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under Business &
2 Professions Code § 17021.

3 114. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California’s wage
4 and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide
5 mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses, and failure to
6 timely pay wages upon separation of employment, all to decrease their costs and increase profits.

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

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

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

17 118. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
18 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
19 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
20 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

21 119. A violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* may be
22 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
23 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, are
24 unlawful and in violation of public policy, and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive,
25 fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
26 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

27 120. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has no plain,
28 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which they have suffered as a

1 consequence of Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of
2 the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
3 and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
4 harm unless Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
5 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

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

12 122. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
13 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
14 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining Defendants, and each of them, from
15 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in
16 the future.

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

23 **VI. PAGA CAUSES OF ACTION (Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)**

24 124. Plaintiff is an "aggrieved employee" under the PAGA as he was employed by
25 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
26 violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil
27 action filed on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved
28

employees in California against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

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

126. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have elapsed since the date Plaintiff provided the written notice of the claims alleged herein without the LWDA assuming jurisdiction over the claims alleged. Accordingly, Plaintiff has fully satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit under the PAGA.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES

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

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

127. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

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

129. As a result of the Defendants’ policies and practices alleged herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and regular wages. Thus, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they were performing and, as a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked.

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

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

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

10 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

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

13 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

14 133. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
15 as if fully alleged herein.

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

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

24 136. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by
25 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to
26 Defendants' policies and practices alleged herein, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and
27 the Aggrieved Employees for all required overtime compensation.

28 ///

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

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

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

11 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS**

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

14 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

15 140. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
16 as if fully alleged herein.

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

19 142. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
20 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

21 143. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
22 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
23 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
24 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
25 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
26 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
27 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.
28

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

4 145. At all relevant times herein, and based on the allegations herein, Plaintiff and the
5 Aggrieved Employees were denied the meal periods to which they were entitled. Therefore,
6 Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Order every pay
7 period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all mandatory
8 meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees one additional
9 hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

10 146. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
11 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
12 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
13 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
14 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

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

19 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

22 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

23 148. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
24 as if fully alleged herein.

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

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

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

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

9 153. At all relevant times, and based on the allegations herein, Defendants failed to
10 provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4
11 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Thus, Defendants
12 violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Order every pay period
13 because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all mandatory rest
14 periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees one additional hour
15 of compensation in lieu thereof.

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

19 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

21 (Labor Code § 2802)

22 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

23 155. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
24 as if fully alleged herein.

25 156. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
26 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing reimbursement of
27 business expenses.

28 ///

1 157. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
2 expenses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to directions of their employer.

3 158. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants
4 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to incur substantial business-related expenses
5 and costs without reimbursement. Thus, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they
6 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for expenses incurred as a direct
7 consequence of Plaintiff's employment with Defendant and/or under the direction of Defendants.

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

11 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

13 (Labor Code § 204)

14 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

15 160. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
16 as if fully alleged herein.

17 161. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
18 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the timing of payment
19 of wages each period.

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

25 163. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states "[t]he requirements of this section shall
26 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
27 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period."
28

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

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

FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

166. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

167. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing and payment of final wages.

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

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

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

171. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not

1 limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, vacation and sick pay at the proper rates, and
2 meal and rest period premiums, within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

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

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

9 **SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

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

12 (Labor Code § 226)

13 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

14 174. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
15 as if fully alleged herein.

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

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

25 177. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
26 and the Aggrieved Employees due to violations including: failure to accurately state total hours
27 worked (for example, the wage statements failed to accurately reflect the compensable hours
28 worked); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to accurately state all deductions;

1 failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including
2 the accurate overtime rate of pay); failure to accurately state the corresponding number of hours
3 worked at each hourly rate; and failure to accurately identify the name and address of the legal
4 entity of the employer.

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

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

11 **SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO MAINTAIN RECORDS**

13 (Labor Code § 1174, *et seq.*; IWC Wage Order § 6(A) or § 7(A))

14 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

15 180. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
16 as if fully alleged herein.

17 181. Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep payroll records showing the hours
18 worked daily by and the wages paid to each employee "for not less than three years."

19 182. The applicable IWC Wage Order, at either § 6(A) or § 7(A) [depending on which
20 IWC Wage Order applies], requires that an employer keep "accurate information with respect to
21 each employee" including, but not limited to: time records showing when the employee begins
22 and ends each work period, whether an employee took a meal period and when it occurred, daily
23 hours worked, total wages paid each payroll period, and total hours worked during the payroll
24 period and the applicable rates of pay.

25 183. Here, Defendants failed to maintain records for each Aggrieved Employee as
26 required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC Wage Order. Notably, Defendants did
27 not maintain the records as required, did not maintain them for the required 3-year period, and
28 failed to keep accurate records due to the wage and timekeeping violations discussed above.

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

4 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and all others
6 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
7 follows:

8 1. As to the Ninth through Seventeenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all
9 applicable and available remedies under PAGA;

10 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under PAGA;

11 3. That the First through Eighth Causes of Action be certified as a class action;

12 4. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;

13 5. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;

14 6. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Eighth
15 Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and
16 Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;

17 7. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by
18 law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;

19 8. For injunctive relief and/or restitution as provided by the Labor Code and
20 Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;

21 9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200,
22 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194,
23 1197, 1198, 1199, and 2802, among other sections inadvertently omitted;

24 10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
25 not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties according to proof, including interest
26 thereon;

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

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

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

Dated: August 4, 2023

BY:

Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
Peter J. Carlson, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

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

On August 4, 2023, I caused to be served the foregoing document(s) described as follows:

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

☒ **State** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on August 4, 2023, Riverside, California.

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


Tracie Chiarito, Declarant

SERVICE LIST

Matthew C. Sgnilek, Esq.
O'HAGAN & MEYER
3200 Park Center Drive, #700
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
949-942-8500
949-942-8510-fax

msgnilek@ohaganmeyer.com

Attorneys for Defendant HOWARD ROOFING COMPANY