

1 **BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.**
David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)
2 *david@tomorrowlaw.com*
Jeffrey D. Klein (SBN 297296)
3 *jeff@tomorrowlaw.com*
Sarah H. Cohen (SBN 330700)
4 *sarah@tomorrowlaw.com*
8484 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 500
5 Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705
6

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, LAUREN NESTOR and
7 SANDRA GUADALUPE ORTEGA, as aggrieved employees,
and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees
8

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO**
11

12 LAUREN NESTOR, and SANDRA
GUADALUPE ORTEGA, as aggrieved
13 employees, and on behalf of all other
aggrieved employees under the Labor Code
14 Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 REDLANDS COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through
18 100, inclusive,

19 Defendants.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT

10/27/2023 4:32 PM

By: Ragine Mays-Mamudu, DEPUTY

CASE NO.: CIVSB2327089

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1
and 2699**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$25,000.00]

COMES NOW plaintiffs LAUREN NESTOR, and SANDRA GUADALUPE ORTEGA (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), as aggrieved employees, and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys’ General Act of 2004, and allege as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against REDLANDS COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, a California corporation, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“REDLANDS”) and DOES 1 through 100 (“REDLANDS” and DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below, “Defendants”), as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of California (“LWDA”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all other current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period, as further defined herein, and, as it pertains to the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code section 2810.5, Labor Code section 203, Labor Code section 226, Labor Code section 227.3, Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, Labor Code section 2802, restraints on competition, whistleblowing and freedom of speech on behalf of all employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period (collectively, “Aggrieved Employees”).

2. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

3. Venue is proper in San Bernardino County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, San Bernardino County is where the causes of action complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the county in which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiffs, or some of them, and Defendants was due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiffs and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants, or some of them, reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees in San Bernardino County, and because Defendants employ numerous Aggrieved Employees in San Bernardino County.

///

1 4. Plaintiffs are “aggrieved employees” under PAGA, as Plaintiffs were employed by
2 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
3 violations set forth herein. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek to recover civil penalties, as the term “civil
4 penalty” is defined under *ZB N.A. v. Superior Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, under the Labor Code
5 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) plus
6 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, for Plaintiffs and all other aggrieved current and former
7 employees of Defendants during the Civil Penalty Period.

8 5. Specifically, Plaintiffs seek to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
9 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
10 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the
11 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

12 6. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding the provision of notice to the
13 LWDA regarding the herein-described Labor Code violations (the “Civil Penalty Period”),
14 Defendants violated, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7,
15 227.3, 245, *et seq.*, 432, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198.5, 2699,
16 2802, and 2810.5, among others.

17 7. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes aggrieved employees
18 such as Plaintiff, on behalf of Plaintiffs and all other aggrieved current and former employees within
19 the statutory period, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures
20 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

21 8. On or around June 14, 2023, Plaintiffs provided written notice pursuant to Labor
22 Code section 2699.3 online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, of Defendants’
23 violation of various, including the herein-described, provisions of the Labor Code, to the LWDA,
24 as well as by certified mail, with return receipt requested to Defendants, and each of them.

25 9. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
26 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants’ alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
27 calendar days of the June 14, 2023 postmarked date of the herein-described notice sent by Plaintiffs
28 to the LWDA and Defendants.

PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS

10. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to pay overtime wages to Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees in the State of California in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a result of, without limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees working over eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek without paying them proper overtime wages, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to remain on-call, to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out (including answering calls from dispatch and others), to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; failing to include all forms of remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, and other forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay; and detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked, and for paying straight pay instead of overtime pay to the detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

11. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a practice or policy of failing to compensate Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Defendants' control as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; by requiring employees: to remain on-call; to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out (including answering calls from dispatch and others), to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours

1 than actually worked; failing to pay reporting time pay; and paid time off and vacation time owed;
2 failing to pay split shift premiums; and failing to pay reporting time pay to the detriment of Plaintiffs
3 and Class Members, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

4 12. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
5 of failing to provide Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted,
6 timely, and complete meal period for days on which the employee worked in excess of five (5) and
7 ten (10) hours per day without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal
8 periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, without limitation, by interrupting meal periods;
9 not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short
10 meal periods; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal
11 periods; not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call
12 meal periods; and/or auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during
13 which employees worked, as required by California wage and hour laws

14 13. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
15 of failing to provide Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees paid, uninterrupted, timely, and
16 complete rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fractions
17 thereof, or compensation in lieu thereof, including, without limitation, by failing to provide rest
18 periods all together; requiring that they be bundled together and/or with meal periods; interrupting
19 them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during rest periods not
20 providing them in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and/or
21 otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods, as required by California wage and hour laws.

22 14. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
23 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish
24 Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect
25 gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all deductions; all
26 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked
27 at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of
28

1 the legal entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other
2 such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

3 15. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
4 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish
5 Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees with documents signed to obtain or hold employment
6 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
7 under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees to
8 calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments, to the detriment of Plaintiffs and other
9 Aggrieved Employees.

10 16. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
11 of failing to timely pay Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees, among other wages, all wages
12 owed as a result of Defendants' practice or policy of failing to pay, among other wages, overtime
13 wages, minimum wages, premium wages, paid time off and vacation time owed as required by Labor
14 Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

15 17. At all relevant times herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing
16 to pay Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees their paid time off and vacation time owed upon
17 separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code section 227.3
18 and applicable Wage Orders.

19 18. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
20 failing and refusing, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
21 limitation, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for purchasing
22 laptops, face masks and for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone
23 plans, in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions
24 of Defendants, as required by Labor Code 2802.

25 19. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
26 failing to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft
27 Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved
28 Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment;

allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the name, address, and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code section 2810.5.

20. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California law (including, without limitation Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*), and also did not permit its use upon request as contemplated under California laws, to the detriment of Plaintiffs and all other Aggrieved Employees.

21. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month."

22. Plaintiffs, in their representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

23. Plaintiff LAUREN NESTOR is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that Defendants employed Plaintiff LAUREN NESTOR as a non-exempt employee, with duties that included, but were not limited to, handling all of the entries for all other units, from approximately November of 2019 through approximately November of 2022.

24. Plaintiff SANDRA GUADALUPE ORTEGA is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that

1 Defendants employed Plaintiff SANDRA GUADALUPE ORTEGA as a non-exempt employee,
2 with duties that included, but were not limited to, collection for high dollar amounts, follow up with
3 insurance, train other employees, and refund requests due to over payment, from approximately July
4 of 2021 through approximately June of 2022.

5 **B. Defendants**

6 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that defendant
7 REDLANDS COMMUNITY HOSPITAL is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a nonprofit
8 corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and
9 doing business in the County of San Bernardino, State of California.

10 26. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
11 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiffs,
12 who therefore sue defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
13 Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated
14 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
15 Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities
16 of the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known. Plaintiffs
17 are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects
18 pertinent to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business
19 plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable
20 to the other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to "Defendants," it
21 shall include REDLANDS COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or
22 affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

23 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

24 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
25 mentioned herein, each of the defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
26 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
27 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
28 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

28. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded, acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

29. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys' General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)

30. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all of the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210

31. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that: “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

32. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5 shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each

1 failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

2 33. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of
3 failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as
4 per Labor Code section 204. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other
5 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor
6 Code section 204, in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for
7 each initial violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee
8 for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor
9 Code section 204.

10 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3

11 34. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code
12 section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
13 with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net
14 wages earned; the name and address of each employer with whom they have been placed to work;
15 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
16 worked at each hourly rate; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal
17 entity securing the employer’s services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such
18 information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

19 35. Labor Code section 226.3 states that “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
20 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
21 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
22 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
23 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.”

24 36. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that “[t]he civil penalties provided for in
25 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.”

26 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
27 and have a policy or practice of failing to furnish non-exempt employees, including, without
28 limitation, Plaintiff, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total

1 hours worked; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect and the
2 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate in effect during the pay period; the legal
3 name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal entity securing the employer's
4 services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such information as required by Labor
5 Code section 226, subdivision (a).

6 38. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are
7 entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision
8 (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
9 for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay
10 period for each subsequent violation.

11 Violation of Labor Code § 558

12 39. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other person
13 acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating
14 hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission" shall be subject to a civil
15 penalty as follows:

16 40. For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee and for each
17 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover
18 underpaid wages;

19 41. For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
20 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount
21 sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

22 42. Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee."

23 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and
24 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections described herein, including
25 causing Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not to: be paid with the rates of pay and overtime
26 rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the
27 regular payday designated by employer, the name of the employer, including any "doing business
28 as" names used, the name, address, and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance

1 carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information.

2 44. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
3 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
4 civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
5 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars
6 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

7 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

8 45. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required
9 every person employing labor in California to "[a]llow any member of the commission or the
10 employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or
11 employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are
12 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,
13 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,
14 or papers of the person."

15 46. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required
16 every person employing labor in California to "[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of
17 all employees employed and the ages of all minors."

18 47. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
19 every person employing labor in California to "[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the
20 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
21 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
22 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
23 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
24 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee
25 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units
26 earned."

27 48. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, "[a]ny person employing labor who willfully
28 fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate

1 and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any
2 member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision
3 (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

4 49. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
5 willfully failed to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar
6 payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment
7 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
8 under Labor Code section 1174.

9 50. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
10 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
11 recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
12 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per Aggrieved Employee.

13 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

14 51. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other
15 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
16 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
17 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
18 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
19 Section 203 as follows:

20 52. For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100)
21 for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid. This amount
22 shall be in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant
23 to Section 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

24 53. For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty dollars
25 (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid
26 regardless of whether the initial violation is intentionally committed. This amount shall be in
27 addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
28 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

54. Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

55. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants, without limitation, routinely failing to pay Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees' minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Defendants' control due to, without limitation, routinely failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked; detrimental rounding or manipulation of time entries; paying straight pay instead of overtime or otherwise failing to pay overtime hours at the proper overtime rate of pay; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, entitling Plaintiff and other aggrieved Employees to actual and liquidated damages.

56. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations, pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

57. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

///

///

///

///

///

58. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), for all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, the established civil penalty for a violation of those provisions is as follows: if, at the time of the alleged violation, the person employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

59. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that Defendants, and each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described herein, including, without limitation, for the failure to: pay the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Defendants, the name of the employer, including “doing business as” names used, the name, address, and telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code section 2810.5, failing to provide Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws.

60. Moreover, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California whom he seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

61. Plaintiffs hereby request a trial by jury.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, on behalf of Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants as follows:

- A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

- 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

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

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28