

JEREMY F. BOLLINGER (SBN 240132)
ARI E. MOSS (SBN 238579)
JORGE A. FLORES (SBN 333441)
MARIELA I. DE LOERA FIGUEROA (SBN 349500)
MOSS BOLLINGER LLP
15300 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 207
Sherman Oaks, California 91403
Telephone: (310) 982-2984
Facsimile: (818) 963-5954
dennis@mossbollinger.com
jeremy@mossbollinger.com
ari@mossbollinger.com
anthony@mossbollinger.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff RAMON FELIX

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

RAMON FELIX, an individual, on behalf of
himself and other similarly situated
employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

OWB PACKERS, LLC, a California
limited liability company, and **DOES 1-50**,

Defendant.

Unlimited Jurisdiction

Case No.:

CLASS ACTION

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:

1. FAILURE TO PAY ALL MINIMUM
AND OVERTIME WAGES
2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE LEGALLY
COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS
3. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
WAGE STATEMENTS
4. FAILURE TO PAY TIMELY WAGES
UPON CESSATION OF
EMPLOYMENT
5. UNFAIR COMPETITION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Ramon Felix (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated
2 persons, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. This is a class action lawsuit brought on behalf of Plaintiff and others similarly
5 situated, under Code of Civil Procedure § 382, seeking unpaid wages and interest thereon for off-
6 the-clock work, illegal time rounding practices, remedies for failure to provide “duty-free” meal
7 periods, inaccurate wage statement penalties, waiting time penalties in the form of continuation
8 wages for failure to timely pay employees, equitable relief, reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs
9 from Defendant OWB Packers, LLC (“Defendant”).

10 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11 2. Venue is proper in the County of San Diego because Defendant OWB Packers,
12 LLC’s corporate offices are located in Solano Beach, California, work was performed by
13 employees for Defendant OWB Packers, LLC in the County of San Diego, and the legal
14 obligations of Defendant OWB Packers, LLC to Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees
15 were breached in San Diego County, California.

16 3. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under Article 6 of the California
17 Constitution and California Code of Civil Procedure § 410.10.

18 4. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ claims for unpaid
19 overtime and minimum wages under California Labor Code § 1194.

20 5. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ claims for waiting
21 time penalties and meal period violations under California Labor Code § 218 *et seq.*

22 6. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s and the Class Members’ claims for
23 restitution of unpaid wages and other ill-gotten benefits arising from Defendant’s unlawful and/or
24 unfair business practices under California Business & Professions Code §§17200 *et seq.*

25 **THE PARTIES**

26 **A. Plaintiff**

27 7. Plaintiff is over the age of eighteen, and at times mentioned in this complaint, was
28

1 a resident of California. During the relevant period, Plaintiff worked as a forklift driver at
2 Defendant's beef processing plant California. Defendant employed Plaintiff from approximately
3 April 13, 2023 to on or about May 5, 2023.

4 8. Plaintiff seeks to represent similarly situated non-exempt employees of Defendant
5 who, during the relevant period, were subjected to the following violations of California laws:
6 Labor Code Sections 201-203, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1199 the applicable
7 Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders, including, Wage Order 8-2001, and Bus.
8 & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

9 9. As such, Plaintiff appears in this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of all
10 others similarly situated.

11 **B. Defendant**

12 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that OWB Packers, LLC is
13 a California limited liability company with its principal place of business located in San Diego,
14 California. Defendant OWB Packers, LLC processes and packs beef for distribution worldwide.

15 11. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of
16 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES, but is informed
17 and believes and thereon alleges that said Defendants are legally responsible for the wrongful
18 conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will
19 amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when
20 ascertained. Defendant OWB Packers, LLC and the DOE Defendants are collectively referred to
21 herein as "Defendant."

22 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted in
23 all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of one or more of the other Defendants, carried out
24 a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each
25 Defendant are legally attributable to one or more of the other Defendants.

26 **FACTS RELEVANT TO PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS**

27 13. At all relevant times, Defendant employed Plaintiff and other similarly situated
28

1 employees subject to Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1197 and the Industrial Wage Order
2 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders, including Wage Order 8-2001. Under Labor Code Section
3 1197 and subsection 4 of Wage Order 8, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were
4 entitled to receive minimum wages for all hours worked. Likewise, subsection 3 of Wage Order 8
5 entitled to receive minimum wages for all hours worked. Likewise, subsection 3 of Wage Order 8
6 entitled Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees to overtime wages for all hours worked
7 over 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week. Defendant failed to pay all wages for all hours worked
8 in violation of Labor Code Sections 1194 and 1197 and Wage Order 8-2001.

9 14. Defendant’s violations of the applicable Wage Orders constitute a violation of
10 Labor Code Section 558, which imposes civil penalties upon an employer for violations of any
11 provisions regulating hours and days or work in any of the IWC. Labor Code 558(a)(1) and (2).
12 Defendant’s violations of Wage Order 8-2001 (3) and (4) also constitute violations of Labor Code
13 Sections 1198 and 1199, which prohibit employment under conditions of labor that violate the
14 IWC Wage Orders and subject Defendant to additional civil penalties. See Wage Order 8-
15 2001(20).

16 15. As detailed below, Plaintiff suffered and permitted Plaintiff and other similarly
17 situated employees to perform several work-related pre-shift and post-shift tasks. However,
18 Defendant only compensated Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees according to their
19 scheduled worktime. In other words, Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and other similarly
20 situated employees for any pre-shift or post-shift work. As a result of the various off-the-clock
21 work, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees spent between approximately forty to sixty
22 minutes each day performing work related tasks without being compensated.

23 16. Security Checks: Upon entering Defendant’s facility, Plaintiff and other similarly
24 situated employees were required to undergo security checks. Each employee was required to
25 empty their pockets and place personal belongings in plastic bins and walk through a metal
26 detector. If a metal detector went off during an employee’s security check, the employee was
27 required to step aside for further inquiry and search. When this occurred, the other employees
28

1 waiting in line had to wait until further inquiry and search was complete. Plaintiff and other
2 similarly situated employees were also required to undergo the same security procedure when
3 leaving Defendant's facility. Each security check took approximately 5-10 minutes. None of the
4 time Plaintiff and similarly situated employees spent undergoing Defendant's security check was
5 compensated as it occurred prior to clocking in and after clocking out. Thus, Defendant failed to
6 compensate Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees for the ten to twenty minutes they
7 spent undergoing security checks each day.

8 17. Donning and Doffing Protective Gear: After going through the security check
9 (detailed above), but prior to clocking in, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were
10 required to don protective equipment, which consisted of a hard hat, jacket, and overalls. The
11 protective equipment was stored in lockers located 10 minutes from the nearest time clock.
12 Similarly, at the end of each shift, but after clocking out, Plaintiff and other similarly situated
13 employees were required to doff their protective gear and place it in their locker. Plaintiff and other
14 similarly situated employees spent approximately 10 minutes each workday donning and doffing
15 the protective gear. Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were not adequately
16 compensated for all of the time they spent donning and doffing protective gear.

17 18. Clocking In: After donning the required equipment, Plaintiff and other similarly
18 situated employees had to walk for approximately ten minutes to reach the location where the time
19 clocks were located. Although there were several time clock machines available, each employee
20 was only permitted to clock in using their designated machine.¹ Thus, despite there being other
21 machines available, employees were often forced to wait in line to clock in because they were only
22 permitted to clock in using their designated machine. This often led to wait times of around four
23 minutes to clock in.

24 19. Time Rounding: At all relevant times, Defendant had a policy and practice of
25 rounding recorded work time for payroll purposes in a manner which resulted in underpayment of
26

27 ¹ Employees' time clock designation was based on their employee number.
28

1 work time. Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were required to clock in fifteen
2 minutes before their designated start time but were not paid for the time they clocked in early.
3 Instead, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were paid only for the hours worked after
4 the designated start time of their shift. Defendant's rounding policy unilaterally benefitted
5 Defendant. While Defendant rounded for employees who were fifteen minutes early, it did not
6 similarly round for employees who clocked in within fifteen minutes *after* their scheduled shift
7 start time. Defendant's rounding is neither neutral on its face nor in its application and had the
8 result of reducing wages paid to employees.

9 20. Meal Periods: During the relevant time period, Defendant failed to provide,
10 authorize, and/or permit Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees meal periods that
11 complied with California Law. Under Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, and the applicable IWC
12 Wage Orders, including Wage Order 8-2001, "No employer shall employ any person, for a work
13 period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes...Unless the
14 employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be
15 considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked." Wage Order 8-2001 § 11.
16 Under California law, requiring employees to remain on the premises for their meal breaks
17 effectively constitutes an on-duty meal period and must be paid. *Bono Enterprises, In. v. Bradshaw*
18 (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 968 (holding that employee meal periods must be compensated where an
19 employee is precluded from leaving the employer's premises for meal periods because the
20 employee remains under the control of the employer and is therefore not relieved of all duty).

21 21. Additionally, "[i]f an employer fails to provide an employee a meal... in
22 accordance with state law, ..., the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at
23 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period... is not
24 provided." Wage Order 8-2001(11); see also Lab. Code § 226.7(c) ("If an employer fails to provide
25 an employee a meal... period in accordance with state law, ..., the employer shall pay the
26 employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each
27 workday that the meal... period is not provided.").

1 22. During the relevant period, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were
2 required to remain on company premises during meal periods thereby constituting “on duty” meal
3 periods. Accordingly, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were entitled to paid meal
4 period. However, Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees
5 for the on-duty meal periods.

6 23. Inaccurate Wage Statements: Labor Code Section 226(a) requires employers to
7 furnish accurate itemized wage statements in writing that show, inter alia, “(1) gross wages earned,
8 (2) total hours worked...”

9 24. Plaintiff and situated employees received wage statements that did not list all wages
10 earned, including the off the clock work, on-duty meal periods, and premium wages discussed
11 above. In *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.*, 13 Cal.5th 93 (2022), the California
12 Supreme Court confirmed that premium pay for non-compliant meal periods are “wages” for
13 purposes of the Labor Code § 226. Employers therefore have an obligation to report such premium
14 pay on wage statements pursuant to Labor Code § 226. (*Id.* at 121.) As the above infractions
15 explain, Plaintiff and similarly situated California employees were entitled to premium wages that
16 were not paid and, therefore were not reported on wage statements, Therefore, Plaintiff and other
17 similarly situated employees are entitled to penalty payments pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.

18 25. Late Payment of Final Wages: Plaintiff and others similarly situated have ceased
19 their employment with Defendant. Upon the cessation of that employment relationship (as
20 prescribed by statute), they did not receive all wages owed. Namely, said former employees did
21 not receive all of their minimum and overtime wages and premium wages, as described above.
22 Those similarly situated, upon termination, did not receive all owed wages on the date of
23 termination. Therefore, Defendant has violated and continues to violate Labor Code Sections 201
24 and 202, because even if it pays employees timely, Defendant has not paid the aforementioned
25 unpaid wages and wage premiums for meal break violations.

26 26. Likewise, Defendant has violated Section 203 by not paying the waiting time
27 penalties for failure to comply with Sections 201 and 202. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 203,
28

1 other similarly situated individuals are entitled to continuation of their wages, from the day of each
2 discharge they experienced until the wages were paid, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days per
3 discharge.

4 **CLASS DEFINITIONS AND CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

5 27. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of the following Class
6 and subclasses:

7 **Class:** All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant OWB
8 Packers, LLC. employed at any time during the period beginning four years prior
9 to the filing of the Complaint through the date notice is mailed to the Class.

10 **Wage Statement Subclass:** All current and former non-exempt employees of
11 Defendant OWB Packers, LLC employed at any time during the one year
12 preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date notice is mailed to the
13 Class.

14 **Waiting Time Penalty Subclass:** All current and former non-exempt employees
15 of Defendant OWB Packers, LLC whose employment by OWB Packers, LLC in
16 California ended at any time during the three years preceding the filing of the
17 Complaint through the date notice is mailed to the Class, including, but not limited
18 to, anyone who may have been reemployed by Defendant after their employment
19 ended.

20 28. This action has been brought and may be properly maintained as a class action
21 pursuant to the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and other applicable law.

22 29. **Numerosity:** Code of Civil Procedure § 382: members of the Class are so numerous
23 that their individual joinder is impracticable. Plaintiff estimates that there are no less than 50
24 persons in each of the classes. The precise number of Class members and their addresses are
25 unknown to Plaintiff. However, Plaintiff is informed and believes that the number can be obtained
26 from Defendant's records. Class members may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail,
27 electronic mail, the Internet, or published notice.

1 30. **Existence of Predominance of Common Questions of Fact and Law:** Code of
2 Civil Procedure § 382: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the
3 Classes. These questions predominate over any questions effecting only individual members of
4 the classes. These common factual and legal questions include:

- 5 (a) Whether Defendant failed to pay class members all wages for time spent
6 undergoing security checks;
- 7 (b) Whether Defendant failed to pay class members all wages for time spent
8 donning and doffing;
- 9 (c) Whether Defendant failed to pay class members all wages for time spent
10 waiting to clock in;
- 11 (d) Whether Defendant reduced class members' wages through its time rounding
12 policy;
- 13 (e) Whether Defendant's time rounding policy is neutral on its face or in its
14 application;
- 15 (f) Whether Defendant failed to provide meal periods in in compliance with
16 Labor Code §§ 512, 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders;
- 17 (g) Whether Defendant failed to pay class members all wages owed for on-duty
18 meal periods;
- 19 (h) Whether Defendant issued accurate itemized wage statements;
- 20 (i) Whether Defendant failed to provide class members who ceased employment
21 with Defendant all wages owed at the time of the cessation of the employee-
22 employer relationship;
- 23 (j) Whether Defendant committed unlawful business practices or acts within the
24 meaning of Business & Professions Code Sects. 17200 *et seq.*;
- 25 (k) Whether, as a consequence of Defendant's unlawful conduct, the members of
26 the Classes are entitled to restitution, and/or equitable relief;

(l) Whether Defendant's affirmative defenses, if any, raise any common issues of law or fact as to Plaintiff and the class members as a whole.

31. **Typicality**: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of each Class because Plaintiff, as an hourly paid employee, was exposed to the same unlawful business practices as the members of the classes. Plaintiff sustained the same types of injuries and losses that the Class members sustained. Plaintiff is subject to the same affirmative defenses as the members of the Class.

32. **Adequacy**: Plaintiff will adequately and fairly protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff has no interest adverse to the interests of absent Class members. Plaintiff is represented by legal counsel who has substantial class action experience in civil litigation and employment law.

33. **Superiority**: A class action is superior to other available means for fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the Class and would be beneficial for the parties and the court. Class action treatment will allow a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum, simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would require. The monetary amounts due to many individual Class members are likely to be relatively small, and the burden and expense of individual litigation would make it difficult or impossible for individual members of the Class to seek and obtain relief. A class action will serve an important public interest by permitting such individuals to effectively pursue recovery of the sums owed to them. Further, class litigation prevents the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments raised by individual litigation.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL MINIMUM AND OVERTIME WAGES

(By Plaintiff and the Class against Defendant)

34. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as though set forth herein.

1 35. At all times relevant hereto, California Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1197 and the
2 applicable Wage Orders, including Section 4(A) of Wage Order 8, have required Defendant to pay
3 their employees the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked.

4 36. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the other members of the Classes were
5 employees of Defendant covered by Labor Code Sections 510 and 1194 and the applicable wage
6 orders, including Section 3(A) of Wage Order 8, which entitled them to overtime wages for all
7 hours worked over 8 hours in a day or over 40 hours in a week.

8 37. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class were not paid by Defendant during the
9 relevant period the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked and/or all overtime wages owed
10 because Defendant paid wages on the basis of rounded time that did not credit workers with all
11 time worked for pay purposes, and because Defendant suffered and permitted Plaintiff and other
12 similarly situated employees to perform work-related pre-shift and post-shift tasks off the clock,
13 including undergoing security checks, donning and doffing protective gear, and working through
14 meal periods. However, Defendant only compensated Plaintiff and other similarly situated
15 employees according to their scheduled shift times. In other words, Defendant did not compensate
16 Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees for any pre-shift or post-shift work. As a result of
17 the various off-the-clock work, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees performed work-
18 related tasks each day without being compensated.

19 38. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the
20 Class have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid all
21 minimum and overtime wages for all hours actually worked.

22 39. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197 and 1197.1, as a result of the
23 unlawful acts of Defendant, Plaintiff and other members of the Class are entitled to recover the
24 full amount of unpaid minimum and overtime wages in amounts to be determined at trial,
25 liquidated damages for failure to pay minimum wages, prejudgment interest, reasonable attorney's
26 fees and costs of suit.

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE LEGALLY COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS**

3 **(By Plaintiff and the Class against Defendant)**

4 40. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as
5 though set forth herein.

6 41. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant employed Plaintiff and other
7 similarly situated employees subject to Labor Code Sections 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC
8 Wage Order, including Wage Order 8.

9 42. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
10 Orders, Plaintiff and other members of the Class were entitled to receive a duty-free meal period
11 of at least 30 minutes for each workday they worked more than 5 hours in one workday and a
12 second meal period after working 10 hours in one day. Under California law, requiring employees
13 to remain on the premises for their meal breaks constitutes an on-duty meal period and must be
14 paid. *Bono Enterprises, Inc. v. Bradshaw* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 968. Plaintiff and other members
15 of the Class were entitled to an additional hour of pay for each day a legally complaint meal period
16 was not provided.

17 43. As alleged above, Defendant required that Plaintiff and other members of the Class
18 remain on company premises during meal periods, thereby constituting on-duty meal periods.

19 44. Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and other members of the Class for the
20 on-duty meal periods. Additionally, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other members of the
21 Class meal period premiums when off-duty meal periods were not provided.

22 45. Based on the conduct alleged herein, pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7 and the
23 applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff and other members of the Class are entitled, and therefore seek,
24 the recovery of (1) all wages for the time spent taking on-duty meal periods and (2) all meal period
25 premium wages from Defendant in an amount equal to one hour of wages per non-compliant meal
26 period in a sum to be proven at trial.

27 46. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the
28

1 Class have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid for
2 on-duty meal periods and to the extent they were not paid all premiums owed for meal period
3 violations. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant's willful
4 failure to provide Plaintiff and other members of the Class the wages due and owing to them upon
5 separation from employment results in continued payment of wages up to thirty (30) days from
6 the time the wages were due. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 218.6 or Civil Code Section 3287(a),
7 Plaintiff and other members of the Class are entitled to recover prejudgment interest on the wages
8 owed to them for on-duty meal periods and on additional pay owed for meal period violations.

9 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WAGE STATEMENTS**

11 **(By Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Subclass against Defendant)**

12 47. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as
13 though set forth herein.

14 48. Section 226(a) of the California Labor Code requires Defendant to accurately report
15 total hours worked by Plaintiff and the members of the Wage Statement Class, and to accurately
16 set forth wages earned. Defendant has knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor
17 Code section 226(a) on each and every wage statement provided to Plaintiff and members of the
18 Wage Statement Subclass by failing to accurately list all hours worked and all wages earned,
19 including the off the clock work, on-duty meal periods, minimum, overtime, and premium wages.

20 49. As a consequence of Defendant's knowing and intentional failure to comply with
21 Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiff and each member of the Wage Statement Class he seeks to
22 represent are each entitled to actual damages or penalties not to exceed \$4,000 pursuant to Labor
23 Code section 226(b), together with interest thereon and attorneys' fees and costs.

24 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES TIMELY UPON CESSATION OF EMPLOYMENT**

26 **(By Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalty Class against Defendant)**

27 50. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as
28

1 though set forth herein.

2 51. Plaintiff and the other members of the Waiting time Penalty Subclass were
3 employees of Defendant covered by Labor Code Sections 201 or 202 whose employment with
4 Defendant ended during the relevant class period.

5 52. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 201 or 202, Plaintiff and other members of the
6 Waiting Time Penalty Subclass were entitled upon cessation of employment with Defendant to
7 timely payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to termination. Discharged employees were
8 entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to discharge immediately upon
9 termination. Employees who resigned were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid
10 prior to resignation within 72 hours after giving notice of resignation or, if they gave 72 hours
11 previous notice, they were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to resignation
12 at the time of resignation.

13 53. As alleged above, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other members of the
14 Waiting Time Penalty Subclass all wages earned and unpaid prior to termination, including all
15 minimum, overtime and premium wages owed at the time of the cessation of the employee-
16 employer relationship in accordance with Labor Code Section 201 or 202. Plaintiff is informed
17 and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times within the applicable limitations period,
18 Defendant maintained and continues to maintain a policy or practice of not paying terminated
19 employees all their final wages, including minimum and overtime wages and meal premium
20 wages, earned before termination due under Labor Code Section 201 or 202.

21 54. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Penalty
22 Subclass all wages earned prior to termination, in accordance with Labor Code Sections 201 or
23 202, was willful. Defendant had the ability to pay all wages earned by employees prior to
24 termination in accordance with Labor Code Sections 201 or 202, but intentionally adopted policies
25 or practices incompatible with the requirements of Labor Code Sections 201 or 202.

55. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 201 or 202, Plaintiff and other members of the Waiting Time Penalty Subclass are entitled to all wages earned prior to termination that Defendant failed to pay them.

56. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 203, Plaintiff and other members of the Waiting Time Penalty Class are entitled to continuation of their wages, from the day their earned and unpaid wages were due upon termination until paid, up to a maximum of 30 days.

57. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the Waiting Time Penalty Class have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid for all wages earned prior to termination.

58. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Penalty Class have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid all continuation wages owed under Labor Code Section 203.

59. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 218 and 218.5, Plaintiff and other members of the Waiting Time Penalty Subclass are entitled to recover the full amount of their unpaid wages, continuation wages under Labor Code Section 203, reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 218.6 or Civil Code Section 3287(a), Plaintiff and other members of the Waiting Time Penalty Subclass are entitled to recover prejudgment interest on the amount of their unpaid wages and unpaid continuation wages.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(By Plaintiff and the Class against Defendant)

60. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as though set forth herein.

61. Defendant is a “person” as defined under Business and Professions Code § 17021.

62. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant committed the unfair business practices, as defined by Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq., by violating the laws alleged to have been violated in this Complaint and which allegations are incorporated herein by reference as though set forth

herein, which allegations include, but are not limited to:

- a. Failing to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all overtime wages due in violation of state law;
- b. Failing to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all minimum wages due in violation of state law
- c. Failing to provide meal periods to Plaintiff and Class Members consistent with California law and paying all premium wages owed for such violations;
- d. Failing to provide accurate wage statements consistent with California law;
- e. Failing to pay final wages upon cessation of employment consistent with California law;

63. As a result of Defendant's unfair competition as alleged herein, Plaintiff and other members of the Class have suffered injury in fact and lost money or property. Plaintiff and members of the Class have been deprived of their rights to minimum and overtime wages for all hours worked; duty-free meal periods, premium wages, accurate wage statements, and/or timely payment of all earned wages due upon termination of employment.

64. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17203, Plaintiff and other Class Members are entitled to restitution of all wages and other monies owed and belonging to them, including interest thereon, that Defendant wrongfully withheld from them and retained for themselves by means of their unlawful and unfair business practices.

65. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees in connection with their unfair competition claims pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated employees, prays for relief and judgment against Defendant as follows:

CLASS CERTIFICATION:

1. An order that the action be certified as a class action;

2. An order that Plaintiff be certified as the representative of the Classes;
3. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be confirmed as Class counsel;

ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. Damages for unpaid overtime wages;
2. Damages for unpaid minimum wages;
3. Liquidated damages;
4. Prejudgment interest;

ON THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. Damages for unpaid on-duty meal period wages;
2. Damages for unpaid additional pay owed for non-compliant meal periods;
3. Prejudgment interest;

ON THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. Damages for inaccurate wage statements for each pay period;
2. Prejudgment interest;

ON THE FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. Damages for unpaid wages earned prior to termination of employment;
2. Damages for unpaid continuation wages owed for failing to pay all earned wages timely upon termination of employment;
3. Prejudgment interest;

ON THE FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. Restitution of all unpaid wages and other monies owed and belonging to the Class that Defendant unlawfully withheld from them and retained for itself;
2. Prejudgment interest;

ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION:

1. Judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the putative Classes and against Defendant;
2. Reasonable attorney's fees;
3. Costs of suit; 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


J. F. Bollinger

Jeremy F. Bollinger
Attorneys for Plaintiff RAMON FELIX

8

9


J. F. Bollinger

Jeremy F. Bollinger
Attorneys for Plaintiff RAMON FELIX

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	