

May 24, 2023

Filed via the LWDA's PAGA Claim Notice Online Form

Copies Sent via Certified U.S. Mail to:

Ponce Ground Service, LLC
9680 Haven Avenue, Suite 140
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Ponce Ground Service, LLC
% Andrea Loveless
30021 Tomas, Suite 260
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

Ponce Ground Service, LLC
10532 Acacia St B1
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Re: *Lamond Nash, et al. v. Ponce Ground Service, LLC*
Notice of Intent to File Suit Pursuant to California Labor Code
Section 2699

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Lamond Nash, Essence Greenwood, and Destiny Nash (collectively "Plaintiffs") and a group of the putative class members in a forthcoming lawsuit against Ponce Ground Service, LLC ("Defendant"). The action, entitled *Lamond Nash, et al. v. Ponce Ground Service, LLC*, is to be filed in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Bernardino (the "Action"). A copy of the complaint as currently drafted, and as is intended to be filed in the Action, is enclosed as **Exhibit A**. This letter incorporates by reference the facts, law, and allegations of Exhibit A.

This letter serves as notice pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), codified at California Labor Code sections 2698 through 2699.6, that we intend to include representative claims in the Action for civil penalties under PAGA on behalf of a group of aggrieved employees. For the purposes of this letter, "Aggrieved Employees" is defined as: *All individuals who are or were employed by Defendant(s) as non-exempt employees in California, from one year prior to the mailing of this notice through the date of trial.*

As set forth in more detail in Exhibit A, Defendant violated its obligations to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees under California law by: failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, failing to pay all overtime wages earned, failing to provide lawful rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums, failing to provide lawful meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums, failing to maintain accurate records, failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses, failing to provide accurate and complete wage statements, failing to pay all wages in full and on time during employment, failing to pay all wages due upon

Notice of Intent to File PAGA Action

May 24, 2023

Page 2 of 2

termination, failing to provide potable water as required by law, and failing to provide suitable toilet facilities as required by law.

Because of these systemic violations, Defendant violated: Labor Code sections 142.3, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2084, and California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders Wage Order 9-2001, and others that may be applicable. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 3364, subd. (b), 3395, subds. (a)(1), (c), 11090.) The enclosed Complaint further details: **(1)** the alleged violations; **(2)** the facts and theories supporting these violations; **(3)** the people and entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions at issue; and **(4)** the illegal practices instituted by Defendant.

Together with this correspondence, the enclosed complaint provides notice that we intend to proceed with a claim for civil penalties in the Action pursuant to PAGA. (See Lab. Code, §§ 2698–2699.6.) We intend to fully prosecute the representative claims alleged in the complaint, including by obtaining civil penalties under PAGA.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew S. Levine", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

ANDREW S. LEVINE

Enclosure

EXHIBIT A

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.

Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218)

jm@melmedlaw.com

Andrew S. Levine (SBN 296872)

dl@melmedlaw.com

Joanne H. Kim (SBN 340608)

jhk@melmedlaw.com

1801 Century Park East, Suite 850

Los Angeles, California 90067

Phone: (310) 824-3828

Fax: (310) 862-6851

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class

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

LAMOND NASH, ESSENCE GREENWOOD,
and DESTINY NASH, individuals on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PONCE GROUND SERVICE, LLC, a
California Limited Liability Company; and
DOES 1 TO 50,

Defendants.

Case Number:

Class Action Complaint For:

1. Failure to Pay All Minimum Wages,
2. Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages,
3. Failure to Provide Rest Periods and Pay Missed Rest Period Premiums,
4. Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Pay Missed Meal Period Premiums,
5. Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records,
6. Failure to Pay Wages Timely during Employment,
7. Failure to Pay All Wages Earned and Unpaid at Separation,
8. Failure to Indemnify All Necessary Business Expenditures,
9. Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements, and

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

10. Violations of California’s Unfair
Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§
17200–17210).

Demand for Jury Trial

1 Plaintiffs Lamond Nash, Essence Greenwood, and Destiny Nash (collectively “Plaintiffs”), on
2 behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated employees within the State of California, complain
3 and allege of defendants Ponce Ground Service, LLC and Does 1 to 50 (collectively, “Defendants”),
4 and each of them, as follows:

5 **I. INTRODUCTION**

6 1. This is a class action complaint brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
7 section 382.

8 2. The “Class Period” as used herein, is defined as the period from four years prior to the
9 filing of this action and continuing into the present and ongoing. Defendants’ violations of California’s
10 laws as described more fully below have been ongoing throughout the Class Period and are still
11 ongoing.

12 3. Plaintiffs bring this class action on behalf of themselves and the following class: *All*
13 *individuals who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during*
14 *the Class Period* (the “Class Members”). (Code Civ. Proc., § 382.)

15 4. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the Class Members, as a class
16 action, against Defendants for:

- 17 A. Failure to pay all minimum wages,
- 18 B. Failure to pay all overtime wages,
- 19 C. Failure to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums,
- 20 D. Failure to provide meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums,
- 21 E. Failure to maintain accurate employment records,
- 22 F. Failure to pay wages timely during employment,
- 23 G. Failure to pay all wages earned and unpaid at separation,
- 24 H. Failure to indemnify all necessary business expenditures,
- 25 I. Failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements, and
- 26 J. Violations of California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) (Bus. & Prof.
27 Code, §§ 17200–17210).
- 28

1 5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the California Industrial
2 Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order applicable to the facts of this case is IWC Wage Order 9-
3 2001 (the “Applicable Wage Order”) and possibly others that may be applicable. (Cal. Code of Regs.,
4 tit. 8, § 11090.) Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or modify the definition of “Applicable Wage
5 Order” with greater specificity or add additional IWC Wage Orders if additional applicable wage orders
6 are discovered in litigation.

7 **II. JURISDICTION & VENUE**

8 6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein
9 pursuant to Article VI, section 10, of the California Constitution and Code of Civil Procedure section
10 410.10 because this is a civil action in which the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest, exceeds
11 \$25,000, and because each cause of action asserted arises under the laws of the State of California or
12 is subject to adjudication in the courts of the State of California.

13 7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants have caused
14 injuries in the County of San Bernardino and the State of California through their acts, and by their
15 violation of the California Labor Code and California state common law. Defendants transact millions
16 of dollars of business within the State of California. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact
17 business, have an agent or agents within the County of San Bernardino, and/or otherwise are found
18 within the County of San Bernardino, and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for
19 purposes of service of process.

20 8. Venue as to Defendants is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to section 395 of the
21 Code of Civil Procedure. Defendants operate within California and do business within San Bernardino
22 County, California. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiffs and all of
23 Defendants’ employees identified above within San Bernardino County and surrounding counties
24 where Defendants may remotely operate.

25 9. This matter is not appropriate for removal under the Class Action Fairness Act (28
26 U.S.C. § 1332) as the amount in controversy for Plaintiffs’ and the Class Members’ claims, in
27 aggregate, is less than \$5 million. Additionally, all the allegations herein occurred in the State of
28 California. As such, even if the amount in controversy did exceed \$5 million this matter would still not

1 be appropriate for removal under the “local controversy” exception to the Class Action Fairness Act.
2 (28 U.S.C. § 1332, subd. (d)(4)(A).)

3 **III. THE PARTIES**

4 **A. PLAINTIFF**

5 10. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs, who are over the age of 18, were and currently are
6 citizens of California residing in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiffs as non-exempt
7 hourly employees in the County of San Bernardino.

8 11. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the following class pursuant to
9 section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure as follows: *All individuals who are or were employed by*
10 *Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the Class Period* (the “Class Members”).

11 12. The Class Members, at all times pertinent hereto, are or were employees of Defendants
12 during the relevant statutory period.

13 **B. DEFENDANTS**

14 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants were authorized
15 to and doing business in San Bernardino County and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiffs and
16 the other Class Members during the applicable statutory periods. Plaintiffs and the other Class
17 Members were, and are, subject to Defendants’ policies and/or practices complained of herein and have
18 been deprived of the rights guaranteed to them by: California Labor Code sections 142.3, 201, 202,
19 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 1174, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5,
20 1199, 2802, 2804, and others that may be applicable; California Business and Professions Code
21 sections 17200 through 17210 (“UCL”); section 3364, subdivision (b), of Title 8 of the California Code
22 of Regulations; section 3395, subdivisions (a)(1) and (c), of Title 8 of the California Code of
23 Regulations; and the Applicable Wage Order (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11090).

24 14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that during the Class
25 Period, Defendants did (and continue to do) business in the State of California, County of San
26 Bernardino. Defendants operations are headquartered in San Bernardino County.

27 15. Plaintiffs do not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
28 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as Does 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said defendants

1 are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiffs will seek leave from this Court to amend this
2 complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiffs are informed, and believe,
3 and thereon allege, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate,
4 were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused
5 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to be subject to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs,
6 injuries, and damages complained of herein.

7 16. Plaintiffs are informed, and believe, and thereon allege, that at all times mentioned
8 herein, Defendants were and/or are the employers of Plaintiffs and the other Class Members. At all
9 times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged
10 to have been done by the named Defendants. Furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the
11 agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents
12 of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said
13 agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, or otherwise ratified
14 every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

15 17. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a
16 joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of and in
17 pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiffs are informed,
18 and believe, and thereon allege, that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiffs
19 and the other Class Members.

20 **IV. COMMON FACTS & ALLEGATIONS**

21 18. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members (collectively, the “Class Members”) are, and
22 were at all relevant times, employed by the Defendants within the State of California.

23 19. The Class Members are, and were, at all relevant times, non-exempt employees for the
24 purposes of minimum wages, overtime, rest breaks, meal periods, and the other claims alleged in this
25 complaint.

26 20. Specifically, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants within the statutory Class Period,
27 working as hourly, non-exempt clerk for Defendants. Plaintiffs’ duties included communicating with
28 the drivers and assigning inbound and outbound loads.

1 **A. MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

2 21. Labor Code section 1197 requires employees to be paid at least the minimum wage fixed
3 by the IWC, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. Similarly, Labor Code
4 section 1194 entitles “any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage . . . to recover in a
5 civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage.” Likewise, the Applicable
6 Wage Order also obligates employers to pay each employee minimum wages for all hours worked.
7 (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11090.) Labor Code section 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an
8 employee under conditions that the IWC Wage Orders prohibit.

9 22. These minimum wage standards apply to each hour that employees work. Therefore, an
10 employer’s failure to pay for any particular time worked by an employee is unlawful, even if averaging
11 an employee’s total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above
12 minimum wage. (*Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324.)

13 23. Here, Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of the
14 law during the relevant statutory periods. The Class Members were not compensated for all hours
15 worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants and/or
16 suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and the Applicable Wage Order.

17 24. Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2, subdivision (a), provide that an
18 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees
19 the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages
20 due and interest thereon.

21 25. When employees, such as the Class Members, are not paid for all hours worked under
22 Labor Code section 1194, they are entitled to recover minimum wages for the time which they received
23 no compensation. (See *Sillah v. Command International Security Services* (N.D. Cal. 2015) 154
24 F.Supp.3d 891 [employees suing for failure to pay overtime could recover liquidated damages under
25 Labor Code section 1194.2 if they also showed they were paid less than minimum wage].)

26 26. Labor Code section 1197.1 authorizes employees who are paid less than the minimum
27 wage fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order of the IWC, a civil penalty, among other
28 damages, as follows:

1 (1) “For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred
2 dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for
3 which the employee is underpaid.”

4 (2) “For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two
5 hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
6 period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the
7 initial violation is intentionally committed.” (Lab. Code, § 1197.1, subd.
8 (a).)

9 27. As set forth above, Defendants failed to fully compensate the Class Members for all
10 minimum wages. Accordingly, the Class Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages for
11 violations of Labor Code section 1197.1.

12 28. Based upon these same factual allegations, the Class Members are likewise entitled to
13 penalties under Labor Code sections 1199.

14 **B. OVERTIME VIOLATIONS**

15 29. Labor Code section 510 requires employers to compensate employees who work more
16 than eight hours in one workday, forty hours in a workweek, and for the first eight hours worked on
17 the seventh consecutive day no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.
18 (Lab. Code, § 510, subd. (a).) Further, Labor Code section 510 obligates employers to compensate
19 employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve
20 hours in a day or more than eight hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. (Lab. Code, § 510,
21 subd. (a).) These rules are also reflected in the Applicable Wage Order.

22 30. In accordance with Labor Code section 1194 and the Applicable Wage Order, the Class
23 Members could not then agree and cannot now agree to work for a lesser wage than the amount
24 provided by Labor Code sections 510 or the Applicable Wage Order.

25 31. Here, Defendants violated their duty to accurately and completely compensate the Class
26 Members for all overtime worked. The Class Members periodically worked hours that entitled them to
27 overtime compensation under the law but were not fully compensated for those hours.
28

1 32. These actions were and are in clear violation of California’s overtime laws as set forth
2 in Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1199, and the Applicable Wage Order. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §
3 11090.) As a result of Defendants’ faulty policies and practices, the Class Members were not
4 compensated for all hours worked or paid accurate overtime compensation.

5 **C. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS**

6 33. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Order, Defendants were
7 and are required to provide the Class Members with compensated, duty-free rest periods of not less
8 than ten minutes for every major fraction of four hours worked. Under the Applicable Wage Order, an
9 employer must authorize and permit all employees to take ten minute duty free rest periods for every
10 major fraction of four hours worked. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11090.)

11 34. Likewise, Labor Code section 226.7 provides that “[a]n employer shall not require an
12 employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute,
13 or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission” (Lab. Code, §
14 226.7, subd. (b).) Labor Code section 226.7 also provides that employers must pay their employees one
15 additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate for each workday that a “meal or rest or recovery
16 period is not provided.” (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c).) The “regular rate” for these purposes must
17 factor in all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by the employee, including non-
18 discretionary bonuses, commissions, and other forms of wage payments exceeding the employees’ base
19 hourly rate. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 878.) Thus, the Wage
20 Orders set when and for how long the rest period must take place and the Labor Code establishes that
21 violations of the IWC Wage Orders are unlawful and sets forth the premium pay employer must pay
22 their employees when employers fail to provide rest periods.

23 35. The California Supreme Court has held that, during required rest periods, “employers
24 must relieve their employees of all duties and relinquish any control over how employees spend their
25 break time.” (*Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 260.) Relinquishing
26 control over employees during rest periods requires that employees be “free to leave the employer’s
27 premises” and be “permitted to attend to personal business.” (*Id.* at p. 275.) The *Brinker* Court
28

1 explained in the context of rest breaks that employer liability attaches from adopting an unlawful
2 policy:

3 “An employer is required to authorize and permit the amount of rest break time
4 called for under the wage order for its industry. If it does not—if, for example,
5 it adopts a uniform policy authorizing and permitting only one rest break for
6 employees working a seven-hour shift when two are required—it has violated
7 the wage order and is liable.” (*Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53
8 Cal.4th 1004, 1033.)

9 36. Here, Defendants periodically did not permit the Class Members to take compliant duty-
10 free rest breaks, free from Defendants’ control as required by Labor Code section 226.7, the Applicable
11 Wage Order, and applicable precedent. (See *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th
12 257, 269 [concluding that “during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and
13 relinquish control over how employees spend their time.”].) At all relevant times, the Class Members
14 were periodically not provided with legally-compliant and timely rest periods of at least ten minutes
15 for each four hour work period, or major fraction thereof due to Defendants’ unlawful rest period
16 policies/practices. The Class Members were often expected and required to continue working through
17 rest periods to meet the expectations Defendants and finish the workday. In some cases when the Class
18 Members worked more than ten hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a third
19 mandated rest period. As a result, the Class Members were periodically unable to take compliant rest
20 periods.

21 37. In such cases where Defendants did not offer the Class Members the opportunity to
22 receive a compliant off-duty rest period, “the court may not conclude employees voluntarily chose to
23 skip those breaks.” (*Alberts v. Aurora Behavioral Health Care* (2015) 241 Cal.App.4th 388, 410 (2015)
24 [“If an employer fails to provide legally compliant meal or rest breaks, the court may not conclude
25 employees voluntarily chose to skip those breaks.”]; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court, supra*, 53
26 Cal.4th at p. 1033 [“No issue of waiver ever arises for a rest break that was required by law but never
27 authorized; if a break is not authorized, an employee has no opportunity to decline to take it.”].)
28

1 38. In addition to failing to authorize and permit compliant rest periods, the Class Members
2 were not compensated with one hour's worth of pay at their regular rate of compensation when they
3 were not provided with a compliant rest period in accordance with Labor Code section 226.7,
4 subdivision (c). Thus, Defendants have violated Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage
5 Order.

6 39. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiffs seek to recover, on behalf of themselves and other
7 non-exempt employees, rest period premiums and penalties.

8 **D. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS**

9 40. Labor Code section 512 and the Applicable Wage Order require employers to provide
10 employees with a thirty-minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal period within the first five hours of
11 work. (Lab. Code, § 512, subd. (a) [“An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
12 more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30
13 minutes”]; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11090 [“No employer shall employ any person for a work
14 period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes”].)
15 Additionally, an employee who works more than ten hours per day is entitled to receive a second thirty-
16 minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal period. (Lab. Code, § 512, subd. (a) [“An employer shall not
17 employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee
18 with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes”].)

19 41. “An on-duty meal period is permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
20 employee from being relieved of all duty and the parties agree in writing to an on-duty paid meal
21 break.” (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.* (2016) 5 Cal.App.5th 926, 932.) The written agreement must
22 include a provision allowing the employee to revoke it at any time. (*Ibid.*) Generally, the California
23 Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (“DLSE”) and courts
24 have “found that the nature of the work exception applies: (1) where the work has some particular
25 external force that requires the employee to be on duty at all times, and (2) where the employee is the
26 sole employee of a particular employer.” (*Id.* at p. 945, internal quotation marks omitted; *Abdullah v.*
27 *U.S. Security Associates, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2013) 731 F.3d 952, 958–959.) “[I]t is the employer’s obligation
28 to determine whether the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved before requiring

1 an employee to take an on-duty meal period.” (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.*, *supra*, 5 Cal.App.5th at
2 p. 946.)

3 42. Here, the Class Members were never asked to sign any enforceable document agreeing
4 to an on-duty meal period. Moreover, nothing in the nature of their work involved the kind of “external
5 force” that might justify on-duty meal breaks. (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.*, *supra*, 5 Cal.App.5th at
6 p. 945.) Nevertheless, Defendants periodically did not provide compliant off-duty meal periods within
7 the first five hours of work for the Class Members.

8 43. As with rest breaks, meal breaks must be duty-free. (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
9 *Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1035 [“The IWC’s wage orders have long made a meal period’s
10 duty-free nature its defining characteristic.”].) Relinquishing control over employees during meal
11 periods requires that employees be “free to leave the employer’s premises” and be “permitted to attend
12 to personal business.” (*Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, *supra*, 2 Cal.5th at p. 275.) Under
13 Labor Code section 512, if an employer maintains a uniform policy that does not authorize and permit
14 the amount of meal time called for under the law (as specified in the Labor Code and/or applicable
15 IWC Wage Order), “it has violated the wage order and is liable.” (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior*
16 *Court*, *supra*, 53 Cal.4th at p. 1033.)

17 44. During the applicable statutory periods here, the Class Members were periodically
18 denied legally-compliant and timely off-duty meal periods of at least thirty minutes due to Defendants’
19 unlawful meal period policy and practices. As a result of Defendants’ uniform meal period policies and
20 practices, the Class Members were often not permitted to take compliant first meal periods before the
21 end of the fifth hour of work. The Class Members were also periodically not permitted to take second
22 meal periods for shifts in excess of ten hours. Defendants thus violated Labor Code section 512 and
23 the Applicable Wage Order by failing to advise, authorize, or permit the Class Members to receive
24 thirty-minute, off-duty meal periods within the first five hours of their shifts.

25 45. Labor Code section 226.7 provides that “[a]n employer shall not require an employee
26 to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or
27 applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.” (Lab. Code, § 226.7,
28 subd. (b).) Labor Code section 226.7, subdivision (c), and the Applicable Wage Order further obligate

1 employers to pay employees one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation
2 for each workday that the meal period is not provided. (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c); Cal. Code of
3 Regs., tit. 8, § 11090 [“If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with
4 the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
5 employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.”].)
6 The “regular rate” for these purposes must factor in all nondiscretionary payments for work performed
7 by the employee, including non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and other forms of wage
8 payments exceeding the employees’ base hourly rate. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021)
9 11 Cal.5th 858, 878.)

10 46. Accordingly, for each day that the Class Members did not receive compliant meal
11 periods, they were and are entitled to receive meal period premiums pursuant to Labor Code section
12 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Order. Defendants, however, failed to pay the Class Members
13 applicable meal period premiums for many workdays that the employees did not receive a compliant
14 meal period. Thus, Defendants have violated Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage
15 Order.

16 47. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiffs seek to recover, on behalf of themselves and other
17 non-exempt employees, meal period premiums and penalties.

18 **E. UNTIMELY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT**

19 48. Labor Code section 204 expressly requires employers who pay employees on a weekly,
20 biweekly, or semimonthly basis to pay all wages “not more than seven calendar days following the
21 close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a), makes employers who violate
22 Labor Code section 204 subject to a penalty of:

23 “(1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to
24 pay each employee.

25 “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two
26 hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25
27 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.” (Lab. Code, § 210, subd.
28 (a).)

1 49. Notably, the penalty provided by Labor Code section 210 is “[i]n addition to, and
2 entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article” (Lab. Code, § 210,
3 subd. (a).)

4 50. Due to Defendants’ failure to pay the Class Members the wages described above, along
5 with rest and meal break premiums, Defendants failed to timely pay the Class Members within seven
6 calendar days following the close of payroll in accordance with Labor Code section 204 on a regular
7 and consistent basis. (See *Parson v. Golden State FC, LLC* (N.D. Cal., May 2, 2016, No. 16-CV-00405-
8 JST) 2016 WL 1734010, at p. *3–5, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58299 [finding that a failure to pay rest
9 period premiums can support claims under Labor Code sections 203 and 204].)

10 **F. UNTIMELY WAGES AT SEPARATION**

11 51. Labor Code section 203 provides “if an employer willfully fails to pay . . . any wages
12 of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty”
13 for up to thirty days. (Lab. Code § 203; *Mamika v. Barca* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 487, 492.) As a result
14 of Defendants’ failure to pay the Class Members for the wages described above, along with rest and
15 meal break premiums, Defendants violated and continue to violate Labor Code section 203.

16 52. Due to Defendants’ faulty pay policies, those Class Members whose employment with
17 Defendants concluded were not compensated for each and every hour worked at the appropriate rate.
18 Defendants have failed to pay formerly-employed Class Members whose sums were certain at the time
19 of termination within at least seventy-two hours of their resignation and have failed to pay those sums
20 for thirty days thereafter.

21 **G. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

22 53. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 2802, which
23 states that “an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or losses
24 incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her
25 obedience to the directions of the employer.” The purpose of this section is to “prevent employers from
26 passing along their operating expenses onto their employees.” (*Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.*
27 (2007) 42 Cal.4th 554, 562.)
28

1 54. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 2804, which
2 states that “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits
3 of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his
4 personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State.”

5 55. Thus, the Class Members were and are entitled to reimbursement for the expenses they
6 incurred during the course of their duties. The duty to reimburse even extends to the use of equipment
7 the employee may already own and would be required to pay for anyway. (*Cochran v. Schwan’s Home*
8 *Serv., Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1144 [“The threshold question in this case is this: Does an
9 employer always have to reimburse an employee for the reasonable expense of the mandatory use of a
10 personal cell phone, or is the reimbursement obligation limited to the situation in which the employee
11 incurred an extra expense that he or she would not have otherwise incurred absent the job? The answer
12 is that reimbursement is always required. Otherwise, the employer would receive a windfall because it
13 would be passing its operating expenses on to the employee.”].)

14 56. Here, Defendants failed to fully reimburse the Class Members for necessary
15 expenditures incurred as a direct consequence and requirement of performing their job duties, including
16 the costs associated with their personal cell phone they required to perform their work. Consequently,
17 Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 2802.

18 **H. WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**

19 57. Defendants also failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with
20 Labor Code sections 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (5), and (9). Labor Code section 226, subdivision
21 (a), obligates employers, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment to furnish an itemized wage
22 statement in writing showing:

- 23 (1) The gross wages earned;
- 24 (2) The total hours worked by the employee;
- 25 (3) The number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if
26 the employee is paid on a piece rate basis;
- 27 (4) All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of
28 the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;

- (5) The net wages earned;
- (6) The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- (7) The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number;
- (8) The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
- (9) All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

58. Due to Defendants' failure to pay the Class Members properly as described above, the wage statements issued do not indicate the correct amount of gross wages earned, total hours worked, or the net wages earned, or the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Thus, Defendants have violated Labor Code section 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (5), and (9).

59. In addition to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Defendants also knowingly and intentionally failed to provide the Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e). Defendants knew that they were not providing the Class Members with wage statements required by California law but nevertheless failed to correct their unlawful practices and policies. (See *Garnett v. ADT LLC* (E.D. Cal. 2015) 139 F.Supp.3d 1121, 1134 [finding the defendant knowingly and intentionally violated Labor Code section 226 because the "[d]efendant knew that it was not providing total hours worked to plaintiff or other employees paid on commission" even though it believed that employees paid solely on commission or commission and salary "are exempt and therefore we do not record hours on a wage statement."].)

I. RECORDKEEPING VIOLATIONS

60. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), requires employers to keep an accurate record of, among other things, all hours worked by employees. Labor Code section 226.3 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

1 “Any employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a
2 civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per
3 violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee
4 for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to
5 provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the records
6 required in subdivision (a) of Section 226. The civil penalties provided for in
7 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.” (Lab. Code, §
8 226.3, emphasis added.)

9 61. Likewise, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), requires every employer, including
10 Defendants, to:

11 “Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which
12 employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by
13 and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any
14 applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or
15 establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established
16 for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not
17 less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from
18 maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis,
19 piece-rate units earned.” (Lab. Code, § 1174, subd. (d), emphasis added.)

20 62. As explained in detail above, Defendants failed to provide the Class Members with
21 accurate itemized wage statements. Defendants did so, in part, because they failed to accurately track
22 hours worked by the Class Members. Defendants have thus failed to keep accurate records of the “total
23 hours worked by the employee[s]” in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), and are
24 therefore subject to the penalties provided by Labor Code section 226.3. These penalties are “in
25 addition to any other penalty provided by law.” (Lab. Code, § 226.3.)

26 63. The failure to accurately track hours worked also resulted in a failure of Defendants to
27 keep a record of all “payroll records showing the hours worked daily by” Defendants’ employees,
28

1 including Plaintiffs and the other Class Members, in violation of Labor Code section 1174, subdivision
2 (d).

3 **J. POTABLE WATER VIOLATIONS**

4 64. Labor Code section 142.3 authorizes the California Occupational Safety and Health
5 Standards Board (“OSHSB”) to adopt occupational safety and health standards and orders. Pursuant to
6 its authority, OSHSB has adopted the “Maria Isabel Vasquez Jimenez Heat Illness Standard,” which
7 applies to all outdoor places of employment. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3395, subd. (a)(1).) This
8 standard requires that all outdoor employees have access to potable water that is “fresh, pure, suitably
9 cool” and provided to employees free of charge. The water must be located as close as practicable to
10 the areas where employees are working. If not plumbed or otherwise continuously supplied, it must be
11 furnished at the beginning of the shift in sufficient quantity to provide one quart per employee per hour
12 for the entire shift. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3395, subd. (c).)

13 65. Here, Defendants failed to provide the Class Members water that was fit to drink, or
14 potable, and free from odors that would discourage workers from drinking the water. No clean water
15 source was made available to Defendants’ employees, including the Class Members. This failure, in
16 addition to violating OSHSB’s safety and health standards (and, by extension, the Labor Code),
17 resulted in a failure to provide adequate cool-down recovery periods pursuant to Labor Code section
18 226.7. (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c) [“If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or
19 recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or
20 applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety
21 and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall
22 pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each
23 workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.”], emphasis added.)

24 **K. FAILURE TO PROVIDE RESTROOMS**

25 66. Labor Code section 142.3 authorizes the California Occupational Safety and Health
26 Standards Board (“OSHSB”) to adopt occupational safety and health standards and orders. Pursuant to
27 its authority, OSHSB has adopted a standard requiring California employers to provide separate toilet
28 facilities for males and females based on the numbers of employees of each sex. (Cal. Code Regs., tit.

1 8, § 3364.) These toilet facilities must be “kept clean, maintained in good working order and be
2 accessible to the employees at all times.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3364, subd. (b).) Likewise, “[w]here
3 practicable, toilet facilities should be within 200 feet of locations at which workers are regularly
4 employed” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3364, subd. (b).)

5 67. Here, Defendants failed to provide the Class Members with suitable toilet facilities
6 within a reasonable distance of their worksite. The Class Members were often forced to urinate and
7 defecate outdoors in unsanitary, humiliating, and exposed conditions. This failure, in addition to
8 violating OSHSB’s safety and health standards (and, by extension, the Labor Code), resulted in a failure
9 to provide adequate cool-down recovery periods pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, subdivision
10 (c).

11 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

12 68. As mentioned above, Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the Class
13 Members pursuant to section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

14 69. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all
15 members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the class is unknown to Plaintiffs
16 at this time; however, it is estimated that the number of Class Members is greater than 100 individuals.
17 The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants’ employment
18 records.

19 70. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of**
20 **Interest:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiffs and all other similarly situated
21 non-exempt employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members
22 including, without limitation to:

23 A. Whether Defendants’ pay policies/practices resulted in a failure to pay the Class
24 Members for all hours worked, including all minimum wages;

25 B. Whether Defendants’ pay policies/practices resulted in a failure to pay the Class
26 Members for all required overtime wages at the Class Members’ regular rate of pay;

27 C. Whether Defendants’ rest period policies and practices afforded legally
28 compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

1 D. Whether Defendants' meal period policies and practices afforded legally
2 compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

3 E. Whether Defendants maintained accurate employment records;

4 F. Whether Defendants timely paid all wages during employment;

5 G. Whether Defendants timely paid all wages earned and unpaid at separation;

6 H. Whether Defendants indemnified their employees for all necessary business
7 expenditures;

8 I. Whether Defendants furnished legally-compliant wage statements to the Class
9 Members pursuant to Labor Code section 226; and

10 J. Whether Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and the Applicable Wage
11 Order amounted to a violation of California's UCL.

12 71. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact
13 predominate over questions that affect only individual Class Members. The common questions of law
14 set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' uniform policies and practices
15 applicable to each individual class member, such as Defendants' uniform policy and practice of failing
16 to pay for all hours worked, Defendants' uniform policies and practices which failed to provide
17 compliant rest periods, Defendants' uniform policies and practices which failed to provide compliant
18 meal periods, Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and others. As such,
19 the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class
20 member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

21 72. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class Members
22 because Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the
23 statute(s) of limitation applicable to each cause of action pleaded in this complaint. As alleged herein,
24 Plaintiffs, like the other Class Members, were deprived of minimum, regular, and overtime wages
25 because of Defendants' unlawful timekeeping policies and practices, were deprived of rest periods and
26 premium wages in lieu thereof, were deprived of meal periods and premium wages in lieu thereof, were
27 subject to Defendants' uniform rest period policies and practices, were subject to Defendants' uniform
28 meal period policies and practices, were not provided accurate itemized wage statements, were not paid

1 all wages in full and on time, , and were subject to other similar policies and practices to which the
2 Class Members were subject.

3 73. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiffs are fully prepared to take all necessary steps
4 to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the Class Members. Moreover, Plaintiffs' attorneys
5 are ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the Class Members and Plaintiffs.
6 Plaintiffs' attorneys have prosecuted numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal court
7 in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class Members.

8 74. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an
9 important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California.
10 These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers
11 who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior
12 economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of
13 this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiffs and the Class Members make the class action
14 format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each
15 employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an
16 unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of
17 each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

18 75. Moreover, requiring each Class Member to pursue an individual remedy would also
19 discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action
20 against their former or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent
21 damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the
22 individual Class Members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying
23 verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual Class Members against Defendants herein, and
24 which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants or legal
25 determinations with respect to individual Class Members which would, as a practical matter, be
26 dispositive of the interest of the other Class Members not parties to adjudications or which would
27 substantially impair or impede the ability of the Class Members to protect their interests.
28

1 76. Further, the claims of the individual Class Members are not sufficiently large to warrant
2 vigorous individual prosecution considering the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As
3 such, the Class Members identified above are maintainable as a class under section 382 of the Code of
4 Civil Procedure.

5 **VI. CAUSES OF ACTION**

6 **First Cause of Action**

7 *Failure to Pay All Minimum Wages*

8 *(Against All Defendants)*

9 77. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

10 78. Section 4 of the Applicable Wage Order and Labor Code section 1197 establish the right
11 of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law. (Lab. Code,
12 § 1197; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11090.) Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2,
13 subdivision (a), provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage as required
14 by Labor Code section 1197 may recover the unpaid balance, together with attorneys' fees and costs
15 of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid wages and interest accrued
16 thereon.

17 79. Here, Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of the
18 law during the relevant statutory periods. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members were not compensated
19 for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of
20 Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and the Applicable Wage Order.

21 80. Labor Code section 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under
22 conditions that the IWC Wage Orders prohibit. Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2,
23 subdivision (a), provide that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage
24 is liable to pay those employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages
25 in an amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

26 81. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged herein,
27 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members have sustained economic damages, including but not limited to
28 unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and they are entitled to recover

1 economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief because of Defendants'
2 violations of the Labor Code and Applicable Wage Order.

3 82. Defendants' practices and policies regarding illegal employee compensation are
4 unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiffs and the other Class Members in a civil
5 action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages, liquidated damages, including interest thereon,
6 statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code sections 204, 218.5,
7 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

8 **Second Cause of Action**

9 *Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages*

10 *(Against All Defendants)*

11 83. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

12 84. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, and
13 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all overtime hours
14 worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for
15 overtime work performed. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly pay
16 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all overtime wages earned pursuant to Labor Code section
17 1194 and the Applicable Wage Order. Defendants caused Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to
18 work overtime hours but did not compensate them at one and one-half times their regular rate of pay
19 for such hours in accordance with California law. Likewise, Defendants caused Plaintiffs and the other
20 Class Members to work double-time hours but did not compensate them at twice their regular rate of
21 pay for such hours in accordance with California law.

22 85. Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of California
23 law. This unlawful conduct includes but is not limited to Defendants' uniform and unlawful pay
24 policies and practices of failing to accurately record all the time that non-exempt employees were under
25 the supervision and control of Defendants. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and allow
26 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to recover in a civil action the unpaid amount of overtime
27 premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit
28

1 according to Labor Code section 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, the Applicable Wage Order, and Code of
2 Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

3 **Third Cause of Action**

4 *Failure to Provide Rest Periods and Pay Missed Rest Period Premiums*

5 *(Against All Defendants)*

6 86. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

7 87. Section 12 of the Applicable Wage Order, and Labor Code section 226.7 establish the
8 right of employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten minutes for each four hour period
9 worked, or major fraction thereof. (See Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11090.)

10 88. Due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies and practices described in detail above,
11 Defendants did not authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to take all rest periods
12 to which they were legally entitled. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants have not paid an
13 additional hour of pay to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members at their respective regular rates of pay
14 for each violation, in accordance with California Labor Code section 226.7.

15 89. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiffs and the other
16 Class Members in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest
17 thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the Applicable Wage Order, and California
18 Labor Code section 226.7.

19 **Fourth Cause of Action**

20 *Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Pay Missed Meal Period Premiums*

21 *(Against All Defendants)*

22 90. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

23 91. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege, that Defendants failed in their
24 affirmative obligation to provide their hourly non-exempt employees, including Plaintiffs and the other
25 Class Members, with all required meal periods in accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and
26 the Applicable Wage Order, for the reasons set forth herein above. Despite Defendants' violations,
27 Defendants have not paid an additional hour of pay to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members at their
28

1 respective regular rates of pay for each violation, in accordance with California Labor Code section
2 226.7.

3 92. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal
4 period violations, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the
5 Applicable Wage Order and Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, and Civil Code sections 3287,
6 subdivision (b), and 3289. (See Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, § 11090.)

7 **Fifth Cause of Action**

8 *Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records*

9 *(Against All Defendants)*

10 93. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

11 94. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), an employer shall keep
12 at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed,
13 payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and wages paid to employees employed at the
14 respective plants or establishments. These records must be kept in accordance with rules established
15 for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than two years.

16 95. Labor Code section 1174.5 imposes a civil penalty of \$500 for an employer's failure to
17 maintain accurate and complete records.

18 96. Defendant has intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete records
19 showing the hours worked daily and wages paid to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members. Thus,
20 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members have been denied their legal right and protected interest in
21 having available at a central location at the plant or establishment where they are employed, accurate
22 and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, employees at
23 those respective locations pursuant to Labor Code 1174.

24 **Sixth Cause of Action**

25 *Failure to Pay Wages Timely during Employment*

26 *(Against All Defendants)*

27 97. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

1 98. Labor Code section 200 provides that “wages” include all amounts for labor performed
2 by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
3 task, pieces, commission basis, or other method of calculation. Labor Code section 204 states that all
4 wages earned by any person in any employment are payable twice during the calendar month and must
5 be paid not more than seven days following the close of the period when the wages were earned. Labor
6 Code section 210, subdivision (a), makes employers who violate Labor Code section 204 subject to a
7 penalty of \$100 for any initial failure to timely pay each employee’s full wages and \$200 for each
8 subsequent violation, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld.

9 99. Labor Code section 216 establishes that it is a misdemeanor for any person, with regards
10 to wages due, to “falsely deny the amount or validity thereof, or that the same is due, with intent to
11 secure himself, his employer or other person, any discount upon such indebtedness, or with intent to
12 annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud, the person to whom such indebtedness is due.”

13 100. Defendants as a matter of established company policy and procedure in the State of
14 California, scheduled, required, suffered, and/or permitted Plaintiffs and the other Class Members, to
15 work without full compensation, to work without legally-compliant off-duty meal periods, to work
16 without legally-compliant off-duty rest periods, and thereby failed to fully pay Plaintiffs and the other
17 Class Members within seven days of the close of payroll, as required by law.

18 101. Defendants, as a matter of established company policy and procedure in the State of
19 California, falsely deny they owe Plaintiffs and the other Class Members these wages, with the intent
20 of securing for itself a discount upon its indebtedness and/or to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay,
21 and/or defraud Plaintiffs and the other Class Members.

22 102. Defendants’ pattern, practice, and uniform administration of its corporate policy of
23 illegally denying employees compensation, as described herein, is unlawful and entitles Plaintiffs and
24 the other Class Members to recover, pursuant to Labor Code section 218, the unpaid balance of the
25 compensation owed to them in a civil action and any applicable penalties, attorney fees, and interest
26 owed to them pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 and 218.5.

1
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

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

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

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

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

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

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

0
1
2
3
4
5
6

4
5
6

56

6

7

109. California Labor Code Section 2802 states that employers must “indemnify” an employee for “all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.” Likewise, Labor Code section 2804 states that “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State.”

110. Here, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members paid out of pocket for necessary business expenditures incurred as a direct consequence and requirement of performing their job duties, including the costs associated with their personal cell phone they required to perform their work. Despite knowing that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members incurred these necessary business expenses, and requiring Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to use such items, Defendants did not reimburse them.

111. Thus, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the cost of such necessary business expenses, plus interest from the date each incurred such business expenses, plus fees and costs. (Lab. Code, § 2802, subds. (b), (c).)

Ninth Cause of Action

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

(Against All Defendants)

112. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

113. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), obligates employers, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment to furnish an itemized wage statement in writing showing:

- (1) The gross wages earned;
- (2) The total hours worked by the employee;
- (3) The number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece rate basis;
- (4) All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- (5) The net wages earned;

- 1 (6) The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- 2 (7) The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
- 3 security number or an employee identification number other than a social
- 4 security number;
- 5 (8) The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
- 6 (9) All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
- 7 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
- 8 employee.

9 114. As set forth above, Defendants issued and continues to issue wage statements to its non-

10 exempt employees including Plaintiffs and the other Class Members that are inadequate under Labor

11 Code section 226, subdivision (a). By failing to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members properly

12 as described above, Defendants failed to include required information on their wage statements,

13 including, but not limited to, the gross wages earned, the net wages earned in violation of Labor Code

14 section 226, subdivision (a).

15 115. Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), of the

16 Labor Code was knowing and intentional. (Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (e)).

17 116. As a result of Defendants' issuance of inaccurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiffs

18 and the other Class Members in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiffs and the

19 other Class Members are each entitled to recover an initial penalty of \$50, and subsequent penalties of

20 \$100, up to an amount not exceeding an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per Plaintiff and per each Class

21 Member from Defendants pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), along with costs and

22 reasonable attorneys' fees.

23 **Tenth Cause of Action**

24 *Violations of California's Unfair Competition Law*

25 *(Against All Defendants)*

26 117. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

27 118. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business

28 practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200 through

1 17210, by committing the unlawful acts described above. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and
2 unlawful business practices deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs and the other Class Members
3 of compensation to which they are legally entitled. These practices constitute unfair and unlawful
4 competition and provide an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are
5 currently employing workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and
6 hour laws.

7 119. Because Plaintiffs are a victim of Defendants' unfair and unlawful conduct alleged
8 herein, Plaintiffs for themselves and on behalf of the Class Members, seek full restitution of monies,
9 as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted
10 by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17208.

11 120. The acts complained of herein occurred within the four years prior to the initiation of
12 this action and are continuing into the present and ongoing.

13 121. Plaintiffs were compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this Court action to
14 protect their interests and those of the Class Members, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on
15 behalf of Defendants' current non-exempt employees and to enforce important rights affecting the
16 public interest. Plaintiffs have thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which
17 Plaintiffs are entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

18 **VII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

19 122. Plaintiffs hereby demand trial by jury of Plaintiffs' and the Class Members' claims
20 against Defendants.

21 **VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 Plaintiffs pray for judgment for self and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against
23 Defendants, as follows:

- 24 1. For an order certifying the proposed class;
- 25 2. For an order appointing Plaintiffs as representatives of the class;
- 26 3. For an order appointing Plaintiffs' counsel as counsel for the class;
- 27
- 28

- 1 **4.** For the failure to pay all minimum wages, compensatory, consequential, general, and
2 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2,
3 1197, and others as may be applicable;
- 4 **5.** For the failure to pay all overtime wages, compensatory, consequential, general, and
5 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194,
6 1198, and others as may be applicable;
- 7 **6.** For the failure to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums,
8 compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant
9 to Labor Code section 226.7;
- 10 **7.** For the failure to provide meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums,
11 compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant
12 to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512;
- 13 **8.** For the failure to maintain accurate employment records, penalties pursuant to Labor
14 Code sections 226.3, 1174.5, and others that may be applicable;
- 15 **9.** For the failure to pay wages timely during employment, the unpaid balance of the
16 compensation owed to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members and any applicable
17 penalties owed to them pursuant to Labor Code section 210;
- 18 **10.** For the failure to pay all wages earned and unpaid at separation, statutory waiting time
19 penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 through 203, for the Class Members who
20 quit or were fired in an amount equal to their daily wage multiplied by thirty days, as
21 may be proven;
- 22 **11.** For the failure to indemnify all necessary business expenditures, all unreimbursed
23 business expenses, and interest thereon, that are owed, pursuant to Labor Code section
24 2802, and attorney fees, pursuant to Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (c);
- 25 **12.** For the violations of California's Unfair Competition Law, restitution to Plaintiffs and
26 the other Class Members of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by
27 Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation
28 of Business and Professions Code sections 17200 through 17210;

- 1 **13.** Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6
2 and Civil Code sections 3287 and 3289;
- 3 **14.** On all causes of action for which attorneys' fees may be available, for attorneys' fees
4 and costs as provided by Labor Code sections 218.5, 226, Code of Civil Procedure
5 section 1021.5, and others as may be applicable;
- 6 **15.** For an order enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents, servants, and
7 employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from acting in
8 derogation of any rights or duties adumbrated in this complaint; and
- 9 **16.** For such other and further relief, this Court may deem just and proper.

10 Dated: May 24, 2023

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.



ANDREW S. LEVINE

Attorney for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class