

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203

Edwin Aiwarzian (SBN 232943)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
Vartan Madoyan (SBN 279015)
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020
Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Alameda
05/08/2024

Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court
By: D. Drew Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

ASHLEY DENNIS, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general
public similarly situated and on behalf of
other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiff,

vs.

BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
CO., a California corporation; and DOES 1
through 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: RG20063553

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT, CALIFORNIA § 2698, ET SEQ.**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Failure to Pay Wages Including, *Inter Alia* Minimum Wages)
- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 204 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment);
- (7) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
- (8) Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d) (Failure To Keep Requisite Payroll Records);
- (9) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);

- (10) Violation of California Labor Code § 1198 (Reporting Time Pay);
- (11) Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.
- (12) Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq. (Private Attorneys General Act of 2004).

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff ASHLEY DENNIS (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, and the representative cause of action under PAGA is brought pursuant to California Labor Code section 2968, et seq. The monetary damages, restitution, and statutory and civil penalties sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The “amount in controversy” for the named Plaintiff, including but not limited to claims for compensatory damages, restitution, penalties, wages, premium pay, and pro rata share of attorneys’ fees, is less than seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000).

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all

1 other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this
2 action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3 3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because, upon information and
4 belief, Defendant is a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or
5 otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of
6 jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play
7 and substantial justice.

8 4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendant
9 maintains offices, has agents, and/or transacts business in the State of California, including the
10 County of Alameda. The majority of acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff, the
11 other class members, and the other aggrieved employees took place in the State of California,
12 including the County of Alameda.

13 **PARTIES**

14 5. Plaintiff ASHLEY DENNIS is an individual residing in the State of California,
15 County of Alameda.

16 6. Defendant BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO., at all times herein
17 mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of
18 California, including the County of Alameda.

19 7. At all relevant times, Defendant BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO.
20 was the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes.

21 8. At all times herein relevant, Defendants BRIDGE PROPERTY
22 MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners,
23 joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest,
24 co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting
25 within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers,
26 representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and/or assigns, and all acts or
27 omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission,
28 encouragement, authorization and/or consent of each defendant designated as a DOE herein.

9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

10. Defendant BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

11. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff, the other class members, and the aggrieved employees so as to make each of said Defendants employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

13. The proposed class is composed as follows:

All current and former salaried property-level “managers,” or persons who held similar job titles and/or performed similar job duties, employed by Defendant within the State of California at any time during the period from June 4, 2016 to final judgment and who reside in California.

14. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is

1 unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be
2 greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is
3 readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

- 4 b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members'
5 claims as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately
6 protect the interests of the other class members with whom she has a
7 well-defined community of interest.
- 8 c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of
9 each class member, with whom she has a well-defined community of
10 interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no
11 interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's
12 attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing
13 class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has
14 incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur,
15 costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily
16 expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of
17 each class member.
- 18 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the
19 fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder
20 of all class members is impractical.
- 21 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class
22 action will advance public policy objectives. Current employees are
23 often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect
24 retaliation despite continuing violations of California's wage-and- hour
25 laws. However, class actions provide the class members who are not
26 named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their
27 rights.

28 ///

- 1 16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that
2 predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common
3 questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:
- 4 a. Whether Plaintiff and the other the putative class members were
5 classified as “exempt” in violation of California law;
- 6 b. Whether Defendants’ failure to pay wages, without abatement or
7 reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- 8 c. Whether Defendants’ had a corporate policy and practice of failing to
9 pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of
10 California for all hours worked and for non-compliant meal and rest
11 periods (i.e., short, late, interrupted, and/or missed meal periods and rest
12 periods) in violation of California law;
- 13 d. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to
14 work over eight (8) hours per day, over forty (40) hours per week, and/or
15 over six (6) consecutive days per workweek, and failed to pay the legally
16 required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- 17 e. Whether Defendants failed to use the shift differential
18 pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary
19 performance pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the
20 overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages where Plaintiff and the
21 other class members earned shift differential pay/commissions/non-
22 discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay and overtime
23 wages in the same workweek;
- 24 f. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of
25 meal periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work
26 during meal periods without compensation;
- 27 g. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of
28 rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work

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

- during rest periods without compensation;
- h. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages and all compensation earned (including, regular, minimum, overtime, and premium wages) to Plaintiff and the other class members for all hours worked;
- i. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- j. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members during their employment;
- k. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code; including, *inter alia*, section 226;
- l. Whether Defendants kept complete and accurate payroll records as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 1174(d);
- m. Whether Defendants failed to pay reporting time pay to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- n. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- o. Whether Defendants failed to provide at least one day of rest in a seven-day work week to Plaintiff and other class members as required by California Labor Code section 551 and 552;
- p. Whether Defendants failed to provide notice of material terms of employment to Plaintiff and other class members in violation of California Labor Code section 2810.5;
- q. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- r. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;

///

- 1 s. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary
2 penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
3 t. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to
4 compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

5 **PAGA ALLEGATIONS**

6 17. At all times herein set forth, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by
7 Defendants.

8 18. At all times herein set forth, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the
9 California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the
10 Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") for violations of the California Labor
11 Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved
12 employee on behalf of herself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures
13 outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

14 19. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action under PAGA may be brought by an "aggrieved
15 employee," who is any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom
16 one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

17 20. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violations were
18 committed against her during her time of employment, and she is, therefore, an aggrieved
19 employee. Plaintiff and the other employees are "aggrieved employees" as defined by
20 California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of
21 Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

22 22. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved
23 employee, including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following
24 requirements have been met:

- 25 a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by online submission
26 (hereinafter "Employee's Notice") to the Labor and Workforce
27 Development Agency (herein "LWDA") and the employer of the specific
28 provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated,

1 including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

2 b. The LWDA shall provide notice (herein “LWDA Notice”) to the employer
3 and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to
4 investigate the alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar days of the
5 postmark date of the Employee’s Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA
6 Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-five (65)
7 calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice, the
8 aggrieved employee may commence civil action pursuant to California
9 Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other
10 penalties or relief to which the employee may be entitled.

11 23. On May 23, 2023, Plaintiff provided written notice by online submission to the
12 LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendant BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
13 COMPANY of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been
14 violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff has not
15 received a LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of Plaintiff’s notice.

16 24. Therefore, Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under California
17 Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other
18 remedies, for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7,
19 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and Industrial Welfare
20 Commission Wage Orders.

21 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

22 21. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff, the other
23 class members, and the other aggrieved employees as salaried “exempt” employees in the State
24 of California, including the County of Alameda.

25 22. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff from approximately
26 October 2015 to approximately October 2018 in the State of California, County of Alameda.
27 During the relevant time period, Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff in a
28 salaried position, misclassified her as “exempt,” and paid her on a salary basis.

23. Defendants hired Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees, and misclassified them as salaried “exempt” employees, and failed to compensate them for all hours worked and missed, late, short, and/or interrupted meal periods and/or rest breaks.

24. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff’s, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees’ employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

25. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff’s, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees’ employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees.

26. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees.

27. Defendants continue to employ “exempt” or salary paid employees within the State of California.

28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees worked over eight (8) hours in a day, forty (40) hours, and/or over six (6) consecutive days in a workweek during their employment with Defendants.

29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees. This pattern and practice involved, *inter alia*, misclassifying their positions as “exempt” employees for purposes of the payment of overtime compensation when, in fact, they were “non-exempt,” non-managerial employees according to California law, and failing to pay them for all hours worked, for non-compliant (short, late, interrupted, and altogether missed) meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law.

30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved

employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving wages for overtime hours worked. The deficiencies include, inter alia, requiring Plaintiff, other class members, and the other aggrieved employees to perform work overtime off-the-clock, the failure to include earned commissions, non-discretionary forms of pay such as awards and bonuses, and/or monetary and non-monetary incentives, to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate.

31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees with the required rest and meal periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's, the other class member, and the other aggrieved employee's regular rate of pay when a meal period was non-compliant (short, late, interrupted, or missed), and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's, the other class member, and the other aggrieved employee's regular rate of pay when a meal period was non-compliant (missed, late, short, or interrupted).

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to use earned commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay/non-discretionary shift differentials/non-discretionary incentive pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the premium for non-compliant (missed, late, short, or interrupted) meal periods where Plaintiff's, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees' meal periods were non-compliant (missed, late, short, or interrupted).

34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at

Plaintiff's and the other class member and the other aggrieved employee's regular rate of pay when a rest period was non-compliant (missed, short, late or interrupted), and they did not receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to use earned commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay/non-discretionary shift differentials/non-discretionary incentive pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the premium for a non-compliant (missed, late, short, or interrupted) rest periods where Plaintiffs', the other class members', and the other aggrieved employees' rest periods were non-compliant (missed, late, short, or interrupted).

36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to pay equal to half the usual or scheduled day's work in an amount no less than two (2) hours, nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday in which Plaintiffs, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were required to report to work and were furnished less than half the usual or scheduled day's work.

37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Defendants failed to use earned commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay/non-discretionary shift differentials/non-discretionary incentive pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the reporting time pay for each workday in which Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were required to report to work and were furnished less than half the usual or scheduled day's work.

38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and aggrieved employees were entitled to pay equal to no less than two (2) hours at Plaintiff's, the other class members', and the other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for each day in which Plaintiffs, the

1 other class members, and aggrieved employees were required to report for work a second time
2 in one workday and were furnished less than two hours of work on the second reporting.

3 39. Plaintiff is informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
4 failed to use earned commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance
5 pay/non-discretionary shift differentials/non-discretionary incentive pay to calculate the
6 regular rate of pay used to calculate the reporting time pay for each day in which Plaintiffs, the
7 other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were required to report for work a
8 second time in one workday and were furnished less than two hours of work on the second
9 reporting.

10 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
11 knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved
12 employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation,
13 including earned but unpaid overtime wages, minimum wages, reporting time pay, and meal
14 and rest period premiums, and they did not, in fact, receive all such wages owed to them at the
15 time of their discharge or resignation.

16 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
17 knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved
18 employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff,
19 the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees did not receive payment of all
20 wages, including earned but unpaid overtime wages, minimum wages, reporting time, and meal
21 and rest period premiums, within any time permissible under California Labor Code section
22 204.

23 42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Plaintiff, the
24 other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were not provided with a day of rest
25 as required by California Labor Code sections 551 and 552, because they regularly worked in
26 excess of thirty (30) hours in a week and/or six (6) hours in any one (1) day thereof, during
27 workweeks in which they were required to work in excess of six (6) days, without
28 accumulating or being provided the opportunity to take at least one (1) day of rest, and when

they accumulated days of rest, they were not actually provided the opportunity to take the equivalent of one (1) day's rest in seven (7) during each calendar month.

43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees.

44. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

46. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees that they were properly denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

47. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or over six (6) consecutive days in a workweek and Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees for all overtime hours worked.

///

1 48. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide all requisite
2 uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other
3 aggrieved employees.

4 49. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, other class
5 members, and the other aggrieved employees minimum wages for all hours worked.

6 50. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the other
7 class members, and the other aggrieved employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or
8 resignation.

9 51. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, the other
10 class members, and the other aggrieved employees all wages within any time permissible under
11 California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204.

12 52. During the relevant time period, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to
13 provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, the other class members, and the
14 other aggrieved employees.

15 53. During the relevant time period, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to
16 keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members.

17 54. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide notice to Plaintiff,
18 the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees as required by California Labor
19 Code section 2810.5.

20 55. During the relevant time period, Defendants regularly and consistently failed to
21 reimburse Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees for all
22 necessary business-related expenses and costs.

23 56. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to properly compensate
24 Plaintiff, the other class members, and the other aggrieved employees pursuant to California
25 law in order to increase Defendants' profits.

26 57. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor
27 Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty
28 due to him [or her] under this article."

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 57, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

59. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

60. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members employed by Defendant, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day, more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or over six (6) consecutive days in a workweek at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, or over six (6) consecutive days in a workweek.

61. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provide that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members overtime compensation at a rate of two times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in the excess of eight (8) hours on the sixth consecutive day of work in a workweek.

62. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and no overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

///

63. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, and/or in excess of six (6) consecutive days in a workweek.

64. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to use earned commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay/non-discretionary shift differentials/non-discretionary incentive pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages where Plaintiff and the other class members earned commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay/non-discretionary shift differentials/non-discretionary incentive pay and overtime wages in the same workweek.

65. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other class members. Plaintiff and the other class members did not receive overtime compensation at one and one-half times their regular hourly rate of pay for all hours spent performing job duties in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, or forty (40) hours in a week, or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work.

66. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

67. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

68. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 67, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

///

69. At all relevant times, the IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

70. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

71. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

72. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

73. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

74. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

75. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of ten (10) hours but no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent were required to work in excess of ten (10) hours without receiving a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

76. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of twelve (12) hours were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

77. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium for work performed during meal periods.

78. Defendants failed to relieve Plaintiff and the other class members of all duties and relinquish control over how they spent their meal breaks and failed to provide compliant meal periods.

79. Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to record seemingly complaint meal periods, regardless of whether or not a complaint meal took place.

80. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

81. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to use earned commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay/non-discretionary shift differentials/non-discretionary incentive pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the premium for a missed, late, short or interrupted meal period where Plaintiffs' and the other class members' meal periods were missed, late, short, or interrupted.

82. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

83. Pursuant to applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(c), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

84. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 83, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

85. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

86. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

87. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily work time is less than three-and-one-half (3 ½) hours.

88. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and other class members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

89. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest periods.

90. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

91. Defendants failed to relieve Plaintiff and the other class members of all duties and relinquish control over how they spent their rest breaks, and failed to provide compliant rest periods.

92. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

93. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to use earned commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay/non-discretionary shift differentials/non-discretionary incentive pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the premium for a missed, late, short, or interrupted rest period where Plaintiffs' and the other class members' rest periods were missed, late, short, or interrupted.

94. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7(c), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

95. Plaintiff incorporates by reference reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 94, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

96. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum fixed by an IWC Wage Order or statute is unlawful.

97. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay wages including, *inter alia*, minimum wages, overtime wages, meal and rest premiums, reporting time pay, to

Plaintiff and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. For example, Defendants effectively paid zero dollars per hour for time Plaintiff and the other class members worked off-the-clock performing work duties.

98. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the minimum wage and all wages due as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their unpaid wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorney's fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

99. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover a penalty of \$100.00 for the initial failure to timely pay each employee minimum wages, and \$250.00 for each subsequent failure to pay each employee minimum wages.

100. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 100, and each and every part thereof with the same for and effect as though fully set forth herein.

102. At all relevant times herein set forth, California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of

quitting.

103. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

104. Plaintiff and other class members were not paid, at the time of their discharge, wages earned and unpaid throughout their employment, including but not limited to, minimum wages for time worked off-the-clock to perform work duties, for meal and rest period premium payments, and as a result of Bridge Property's failure to properly calculate the regular rate of pay, and requirement that seemingly compliant meal periods be recorded regardless of whether a compliant meal period was provided

105. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

106. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

107. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 204)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

108. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 107, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

///

1 109. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
2 wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of
3 any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and
4 payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was
5 performed.

6 110. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
7 wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive,
8 of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due
9 and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

10 111. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
11 wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the
12 payday for the next regular payroll period.

13 112. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to
14 pay Plaintiff and the other class members all wages due to them, within any time period
15 permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

16 113. During the relevant time period, Defendants did not timely pay Plaintiff and the
17 other class members wages during their employment, including but not limited to, minimum
18 wages for time worked off-the-clock to perform work duties and for meal and rest period
19 premium payments.

20 114. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover all remedies
21 available for violations of California Labor Code section 204.

22 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))**

24 **(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)**

25 115. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
26 through 114, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
27 forth herein.

28 ///

116. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) 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) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her 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. The deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

117. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, but are not limited to: the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the other class members.

118. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

119. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

120. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor

Code section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

121. Plaintiff and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(h).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d))

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

122. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 121, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

123. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d), an employer shall keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than two years.

124. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Plaintiff and the other class members.

125. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d), Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

126. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) because they were denied both their legal right and protected interest, in having available, accurate and complete payroll records pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d).

///

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

127. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 126, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

128. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

129. Plaintiff and the other class members incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants, including, but not limited to, the costs of the use personal cell phones for business-related purposes and the use of personal vehicles to perform business-related tasks.

130. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

131. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 1198 and IWC Wage Orders)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

132. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 131, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

133. The applicable IWC Wage Orders (including Wage Order Nos. 1-2001, 4-2001, 7-2001, and 9-2001), and Labor Code section 1198 provide that each workday an

employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work, or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the minimum wage.

134. The applicable IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code section 1198 further provide that if an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one workday and is furnished less than two hours of work on the second reporting, said employee shall be paid for two hours at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the minimum wage.

135. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members for two hours at Plaintiff's and the other class members' regular rate of pay for each day in which Plaintiff and the other class members were required to report for work a second time in one workday and were furnished less than two hours of work on the second reporting.

136. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover all remedies available for violation of Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, including and not limited to, unpaid reporting time wages, applicable penalties, interest thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

137. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 136, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

138. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, other class members, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

1 139. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
2 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business &
3 Professions Code section 17200, et seq.

4 140. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.
5 may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants'
6 policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members,
7 to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code
8 sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring
9 employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work through their meal and
10 rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections
11 226.7 and 512(a). Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages (including
12 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, reporting time pay, and meal and rest premiums) and
13 all other compensation violate sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Moreover, Defendants'
14 policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other class members
15 violate California Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 204. Defendants also violated California
16 Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802. Defendants also violated California
17 Labor Code section 2810.5 by failing to provide notice of material terms of employment to
18 Plaintiffs and other class members.

19 141. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants
20 unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

21 142. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured by
22 Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not
23 necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

24 143. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, et seq.,
25 Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and
26 retained by Defendants during a period that commences June 4, 2016; an award of attorneys'
27 fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws;
28 and an award of costs.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq.)

(Against BRIDGE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CO. and DOES 1 through 100)

144. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 143, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

145. PAGA expressly establishes that any provisions of the California Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

146. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

147. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

Failure to Pay Overtime

148. Defendants’ failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

149. Defendants’ failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

///

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

150. Defendants' failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Pay Wages (Including, Inter Alia, Minimum Wages)

151. Defendants' failure to pay wages (including regular, minimum, overtime, and premium wages) and all compensation due to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198.

Failure to Provide a Day of Rest

152. Defendants' failure to provide a day of rest as required by California Labor Code sections 551 and 552, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 551 and 552.

Failure to Provide Notice to Employees

153. Defendants' failure to provide notice containing requisite information in violation of California Labor Code section 2810.5, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 2810.5.

Failure to Pay Reporting Time Pay

154. Defendants' failure to pay reporting time pay in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 1198, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful or unfair activity prohibited by IWC Wage Orders and by California Labor Code section 1198.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

155. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

156. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes a

violation of California Labor Code section 204.

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

157. Defendants' failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a) constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 226(a).

Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records

158. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California Labor Code section 1174(d) constitutes a violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d).

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs

159. Defendants' failure to reimburse Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs in accordance with California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 constitutes a violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

160. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all aggrieved employees, request and are entitled to recover from Defendants and each of them, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, as well as all penalties pursuant to PAGA against Defendants, and each of them, including but not limited to:

- a. Penalties under California Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11010 et seq. in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- c. Penalties under California Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and

1 entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the
2 California Labor Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for
3 each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two
4 hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
5 each subsequent violation; and

6 d. Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California
7 Labor Code and/or other statutes.

8 161. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by
9 aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the Labor
10 and Workforce Development Agency for the enforcement of labor laws and education of
11 employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five percent (25%)
12 to the aggrieved employees.

13 162. Further, Plaintiffs are entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and
14 costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5 and 2699 and any other applicable
15 statute.

16 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

17 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly
18 situated, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private
19 Attorneys General Act, requests a trial by jury.

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all other members of the general
22 public similarly situated, on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private
23 Attorneys General Act, pray for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally,
24 as follows:

25 **Class Certification**

- 26 1. That the first through eleventh action be certified to proceed on a class action
27 basis;
28 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;

1 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and

2 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel, immediately upon its appointment,
3 the names and most current contact information (address and telephone numbers) of all class
4 members.

5 **As to the First Cause of Action**

6 5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
7 Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay
8 all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members;

9 6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special
10 damages as may be appropriate;

11 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
12 from the date such amounts were due;

13 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
14 California Labor Code section 1194; and

15 9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

16 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

17 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
18 Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to
19 provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the other class
20 members;

21 11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one
22 (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal
23 period was not provided;

24 12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
25 proof;

26 13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

27 14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts
28 were due;

15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

16. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Third Cause of Action

17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members;

18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due; and

22. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members.

24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for Plaintiff and the other class members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

26. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due;

27. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);

1 28. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

2 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

3 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

4 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
5 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the
6 time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and the other class members no longer
7 employed by Defendants;

8 31. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
9 proof;

10 32. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for
11 Plaintiff and the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

12 33. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
13 amounts were due; and

14 34. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

15 ///

16 **As to the Sixth Cause of Action**

17 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
18 Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required
19 by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiff and the other class members;

20 36. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
21 proof;

22 37. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
23 amounts were due; and

24 38. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

25 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action**

26 39. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record
27 keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders
28

as to Plaintiff and the other class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

40. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

41. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

42. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(h); and

43. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

44. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 1174(d) by willfully failing to keep accurate and complete payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members as required by California Labor Code section 1174(d);

45. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

46. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5; and

47. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

48. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

49. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

50. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

51. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

52. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

53. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

54. That the Court adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to pay Plaintiff and the

1 other class members reporting time pay.

2 55. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
3 proof;

4 56. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts
5 were due; and

6 57. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

7 **As to the Eleventh Cause of Action**

8 58. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants California Business
9 and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. by failing to provide Plaintiff and the other class
10 members all compensation due to them in a timely fashion, failing to provide all meal and rest
11 periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and the other class
12 members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 204,
13 failing to provide Plaintiff and other class members with complete and accurate wage
14 statements, failing to keep complete and accurate payroll records, and failing to reimburse
15 Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

16 59. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all the other class members and
17 all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

18 60. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
19 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
20 Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections
21 17200, et seq.;

22 61. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
23 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

24 62. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to
25 California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq.; and

26 63. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

27 ///

28 ///

As to the Twelfth Cause of Action

64. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f) and (g) plus costs/expenses and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders; and

65. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

Respectfully,

Dated: May 8, 2024

LAWYERS for JUSTICE, P.C.

By: 
Edwin Aiwanian
Vartan Madoyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff