

1 Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
 kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
 2 Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan (SBN 320389)
 lilit@moonlawgroup.com
 3 Yudi "Annie" Ruan (SBN 345645)
 aruan@moonlawgroup.com
 4 **MOON LAW GROUP, PC**
 1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880
 5 Los Angeles, California 90017
 Telephone: (213) 232-3128
 6 Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Yaquelin Martinez de Manzanares

8
 9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
 10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

11 YAQUELIN MARTINEZ DE MANZANARES,
 12 individually, and on behalf of all others similarly
 13 situated,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 BRENTWOOD SCHOOL, a California
 17 corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

18 Defendants

Case No.: 23STCV15318

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION AND
 PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226]; and
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.];
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff.....	3
B. Defendants.....	3
ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	4
CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS	8
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION.....	12
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION.....	13
THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	14
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	15
FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	16
SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	17
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	18
EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	19
NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION	22
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	24
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	29

1 Plaintiff Yaquelin Martinez de Manzanares (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have
2 evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for
3 further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants Brentwood School, and Does 1
6 through 10 (Defendants are collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code
7 violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum
8 wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and
9 permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure
10 to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses,
11 and failure to furnish accurate wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action individually and as a class
13 action on behalf of herself and certain current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter
14 collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully below). The
15 Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any Defendants in
16 California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations period
17 applicable to the claims pleaded here.

18 3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
19 California Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
20 Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present employees of Defendants (hereinafter
21 referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

22 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
23 establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based
24 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are
25 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
26 (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

27 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants maintained
28 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 1 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
2 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
3 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 4 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
5 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
6 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing
7 to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation
8 occurred;
- 9 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
10 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
11 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
12 period violation occurred;
- 13 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 14 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
15 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the
16 time period specified by California law when employment terminates; and
- 17 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked.
- 18 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
19 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
20 IWC Wage Orders.

21 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
22 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
23 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were
24 willful and deliberate.

25 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
26 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
27 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.
28

Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior”.

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as a custodian from approximately April 2020 to May 2023.

9. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

B. Defendants

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Brentwood School is:

- (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California;
- (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Los Angeles County;
- (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of the putative Class and Aggrieved Employees. Defendant suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.
- (d) At all times mentioned herein, Defendant is and was the employer of Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

11. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

1 12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
2 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
3 injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees in the State
4 of California.

5 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each
6 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the
7 other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages,
8 hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all
9 relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director,
10 controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or
11 predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all
12 of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some
13 or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged
14 below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant
15 to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should
16 have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the
17 conduct of all other Defendants.

18 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

19 14. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of f Los
20 Angeles, State of California, as a custodian during the statutory period. During the statutory period,
21 Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California overtime laws, and paid Plaintiff
22 and the Class an hourly rate of pay.

23 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
24 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
25 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
26 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all final
27 wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
28

1 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
2 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

3 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
4 paying Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all
5 overtime wages. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were required to work "off the
6 clock" and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were
7 required to wait in line in order to clock into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff
8 and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were required to perform duties prior to clocking in, such
9 as getting keys and signing a document stating that the keys were taken, off the clock and
10 uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees performed duties after
11 clocking out, such as organizing and cleaning, off the clock and uncompensated.

12 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
13 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants
14 sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to work in
15 excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted,
16 duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Class
17 and Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of
18 work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class and
19 Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or,
20 for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Further, Defendants
21 automatically deducted meal periods, despite them being short regularly due to the fact that
22 Plaintiff and the Class were required to walk to specified areas for their meal periods. Also,
23 Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not permitting Plaintiff and the Class to leave the
24 premises during meal and rest periods. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not
25 provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Class in compliance with California law.

26 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize and
27 permit Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods.
28 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees

1 to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting
2 them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work
3 (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved
4 Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did not
5 adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest
6 period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing
7 rest periods for Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have
8 adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have
9 adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees
10 were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of
11 employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Class
12 and Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly,
13 Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class and
14 Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

15 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the
16 Class and Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their
17 duties for Defendants without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved
18 Employees were required to use their personal cellular telephones for work purposes, which
19 included communications, texts and emails, without reimbursement. Also, Plaintiff and the Class
20 were required to purchase items for work without reimbursement, which included without
21 limitations, supplies, and additional logo'd shirts for work (only a certain number of uniforms were
22 provided for free).

23 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
24 pay Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all
25 wages for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period
26 premium wages.

27 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Class
28 and Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly

1 rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned
2 for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not
3 provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized
4 and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address). Further, the
5 wage statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As a result of
6 these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved
7 Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 8 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
9 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
10 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
11 entitled;
- 12 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
13 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
14 though they had not been;
- 15 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
16 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the
17 correct California rate even though they were;
- 18 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
19 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
20 California rate even though they had not been;
- 21 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
22 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 23 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
24 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
25 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
26 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
27 statements contained the required accurate information;

1 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
2 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability,
3 unemployment, and other governmental benefits;

4 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
5 rates to which Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were
6 entitled, and Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were paid less
7 than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

8 Thus, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in
9 California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

10 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

11 22. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other
12 persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil
13 Procedure § 382.

14 23. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief
15 authorized by California law.

16 24. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

17 All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly, non-
18 exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before the
19 filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class
is sent.

20 25. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

21 26. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
22 conditions of all Class Members.

23 27. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is readily
24 ascertainable:

25 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
26 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
27 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
28

1 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the
2 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
3 Defendants' records.

4 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
5 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
6 defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any)
7 are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

8 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
9 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
10 defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated
11 herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class
12 Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the
13 rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.
14 Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will
15 continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be
16 necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
17 benefit of each class member.

18 (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the
19 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 20 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling
21 the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
22 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy
23 already commenced by or against members of the Class;
24 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the
25 claims in the particular forum; and
26 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class
27 action.

28 (e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is

1 to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a
2 class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights
3 out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful
4 of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might
5 damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other
6 means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the
7 complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their
8 rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

9 28. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if
10 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without
11 limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- 12 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum
13 wages, and overtime wages;
- 14 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class
15 Members;
- 16 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
17 wages to Class Members;
- 18 (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge
19 or resignation;
- 20 (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and
21 all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
- 22 (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; and
23 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a
24 result of their illegal conduct as described above.

25 29. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
26 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- 27 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
28 question affecting only individual members;

- 1 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
2 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 3 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
4 members of the class before the Court;
- 5 (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
6 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
7 class action;
- 8 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
9 relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation
10 for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an
11 amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for
12 the injuries sustained;
- 13 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual
14 members of the class would create a risk of:
- 15 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
16 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
17 of conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 18 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
19 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members
20 not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or
21 impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not
22 limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those
23 parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 24 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
25 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
26 the class as a whole.

27 30. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
28 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own

business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked)

31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

32. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

33. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

34. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover minimum wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

35. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

36. By virtue of the Defendants’ unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

37. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code § 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage compensation due Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

38. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

39. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees all such wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

40. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

42. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

43. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

44. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees have

1 worked more than eight hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

2 45. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class and
3 Aggrieved Employees overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the
4 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198. Plaintiff
5 and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are regularly required to work overtime hours.

6 46. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
7 compensation to the Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees for their overtime hours
8 worked, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees have suffered, and will continue to
9 suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them but which exceed the
10 jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

11 47. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
12 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
13 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees.

14 48. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees also request recovery of overtime
15 compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor
16 Code § 1194(a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum
17 as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

18 49. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages
19 due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall pay to
20 each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all overtime
21 hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class and
22 Aggrieved Employees with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

23 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

25 50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
26 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

27 51. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
28 Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees of all duty in order to take their first daily meal

1 periods no later than the start of Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees' sixth hour of
2 work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh
3 hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the
4 applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30
5 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor
6 Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under
7 any Wage Order.

8 52. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff and
9 the Class and Aggrieved Employees with both meal periods as required by California law. By
10 their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees to take all
11 meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or
12 impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the
13 provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

14 53. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled
15 to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all
16 required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

17 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

19 54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
20 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

21 55. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10
22 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than
23 two hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that the
24 employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for each
25 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes,
26 the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is
27 itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California
28

1 Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated
2 under any Wage Order.

3 56. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the
4 Class and Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more
5 than 4 hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class and
6 Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made
7 it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully
8 violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage
9 Orders.

10 57. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled
11 to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all
12 required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

13 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)**

15 58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
16 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

17 59. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by failing
18 to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees for their necessary
19 expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their
20 obedience to directions of Defendants.

21 60. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were damaged at least
22 in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

23 61. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees they represent are entitled to
24 attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest
25 pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(b).

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time**
3 **Penalties)**

4 62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs
5 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

6 63. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
7 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due
8 and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or
9 her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless
10 the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
11 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

12 64. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many
13 other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the
14 employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and
15 continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid
16 by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
17 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

18 65. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those Class members who are no longer
19 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
20 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§
21 201 and 202.

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

26 67. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from
27 Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular
28 hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

68. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)

69. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

70. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

71. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees, the failure to list the true "total hours worked by the employee," and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

72. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

73. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by

Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

74. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

75. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

76. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

77. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

78. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

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

80. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

82. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

83. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked

84. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

85. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

86. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

1 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

2 87. Defendants’ failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
3 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
4 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200,
5 *et seq.*

6 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

7 88. Defendants’ failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with
8 California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
9 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

10 89. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
11 herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiff, and
12 all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of
13 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

14 90. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees Members suffered monetary injury
15 as a direct result of Defendants’ wrongful conduct.

16 91. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled to,
17 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
18 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved
19 Employees have been deprived, by means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or
20 fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the Class and Aggrieved Employees are not obligated
21 to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of Defendants in order to recover
22 restitution.

23 92. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further
24 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair, unlawful
25 and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them, from
26 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the
27 future.

93. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

94. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other withholdings.

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

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)

96. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this First Amended Complaint.

97. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

98. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a

1 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
2 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

3 99. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
4 Code § 2699.3. On June 30, 2023, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and
5 Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of
6 the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former Aggrieved
7 Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. At the time of this filing, 65
8 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development
9 Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed
10 in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor
11 Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint.
12 These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210,
13 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

14 100. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California Labor
15 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
16 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by
17 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
18 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins
19 and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.
20 Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total
21 hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

22 101. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
23 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to
24 maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when employees
25 begin and end each work period. Defendants’ failure to provide and maintain records required by
26 the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to
27 know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of
28 their hours worked stated in Defendants’ records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved

1 Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an
2 unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
3 Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment
4 of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel
5 Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts
6 according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code
7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an
8 injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments
9 paid to them.

10 102. Based on the conduct described in this First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled
11 to an award of civil penalties on behalf of herself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved
12 Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to
13 be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted
14 by law.

15 103. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant
16 to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action
17 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

19 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to
20 the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

21 **Class Certification**

- 22 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third,
23 Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;
24 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and
25 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.
- 26
27
28

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

5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

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

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

As to the Second Cause of Action

11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

As to the Third Cause of Action

16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

1 17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
2 such amounts were due;

3 18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
4 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

6 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

7 20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
8 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

9 21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

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

12 23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
13 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

15 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

16 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
17 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

18 26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
19 appropriate;

20 27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
21 such amounts were due;

22 28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

24 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

25 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
26 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of
27 termination of the employment;
28

1 31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former
2 employees who have left Defendants' employ;

3 32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
4 due;

5 33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

7 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

8 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record
9 keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and
10 willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

11 36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

12 37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
13 Labor Code § 226(h);

14 38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

16 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

17 40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
18 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked
19 (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain
20 accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to
21 maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage
22 statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

23 41. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment
24 interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

25 42. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds
26 disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a
27 result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

1 43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
2 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

3 44. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
4 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

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

6 As to the Ninth Cause of Action

7 46. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
8 Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and
9 overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal
10 periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of all
11 hours worked and meal periods, failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay
12 final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

13 47. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof.
14 For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, and all other applicable
15 Labor Code provisions;

16 48. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
17 California Labor Code § 2699;

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

19 As to all Causes of Action

20 50. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

1 Dated: September 13, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

2 MOON LAW GROUP, PC

3
4 By: 

Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Yudi "Annie" Ruan

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff

7
8
9
10
11 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

12 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

13
14 Dated: September 13, 2022

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

15
16 By: 

Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Yudi "Annie" Ruan

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within suit; my business address is 1055 W. 7th Street, Suite 1880, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION AND PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action by sending [] the original [or] [✓] a true copy thereof [✓] to interested parties as follows [or] [] as stated on the attached service list:

100 South Barrington Place
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Agent of Service for Defendant Brentwood School

[✓] **BY U.S. MAIL:** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am “readily familiar” with the firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this **September 13, 2023** at Los Angeles, California.

Karen Castillo
Type or Print Name


Signature