

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

Young K. Park, SB# 287589

E-Mail: young@justiceforworkers.com

William C. Sung, SB# 280792

E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com

3600 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1815

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Tel: 323-922-2000

Fax: 323-922-2000

Assigned for All Purposes

Judge Randall J. Sherman

Dept. CX105

Attorneys for Plaintiff ROBERTO TOSCANO HERRERA

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE, CIVIL COMPLEX CENTER

ROBERTO TOSCANO HERRERA,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

180 SNACKS, INC., a California corporation;
MICHAEL KIM, an individual; and DOES 1
through 50,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2023-01346806-CU-OE-CXC

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

- (1) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);
- (2) **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194,
1198);
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);
- (5) **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE § 226);
- (6) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);
- (7) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE §§ 17200, et seq.); and**
- (8) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
CALIFORNIA PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698, et seq.)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff ROBERTO TOSCANO HERRERA (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all
2 others similarly situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action
3 Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants 180 SNACKS, INC., a California corporation (“180
4 SNACKS, INC.”); MICHAEL KIM, an individual; and DOES 1 to 50 inclusive (collectively
5 “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this
8 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions
9 Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 558.1,
10 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198 and 2698, *et seq.*; and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”)
11 Wage Order 8-2001 (“Wage Order 8”), in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief,
12 and restitution. This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.
13 This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code because the amount in
14 controversy exceeds \$25,000.

15 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have
16 agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including Orange County, and the
17 majority of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in Orange County. Furthermore,
18 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within Orange.

19 **PARTIES**

20 3. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant herein was, an individual over the age of
21 eighteen (18) and is a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to
22 each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee.
23 Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or customs complained of
24 herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et*
25 *seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198,
26 and 2698, *et seq.*, and Wage Order 8.

27 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
28 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,

1 Defendant 180 SNACKS, INC. engaged in and continues to engage in a nut-based snack roasting
2 and sales company in Anaheim, California, and employed Plaintiff and other, similarly-situated
3 non-exempt employees within Orange County, and the State of California and, therefore, were (and
4 are) doing business in Orange County and the State of California.

5 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
6 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,
7 Defendant MICHAEL KIM is an individual residing in California, as well as the Chief Executive
8 Officer of Defendant 180 SNACKS, INC. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based
9 thereon alleges, that Defendant MICHAEL KIM violated, or caused to be violated, the above- and
10 below-referenced Labor Code statutes in violation of Labor Code §§ 558 and 558.1.

11 6. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
12 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said
13 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
14 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed,
15 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
16 partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
17 and proximately caused Plaintiff, the Classes (as defined below), and Aggrieved Employees (as
18 defined below) to be subject to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages
19 complained of herein.

20 7. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
21 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,
22 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
23 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
24 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

25 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
26 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
27 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within
28 the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent

1 said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining
2 Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

3 9. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were members of, and
4 engaged in, a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and
5 scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise.

6 10. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
7 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
8 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged.

9 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10 11. Defendants own and operate a nut-based snack roasting and sales company in
11 Anaheim, California. Plaintiff began working for Defendants as a non-exempt employee from
12 approximately 2020 to approximately September 28, 2022.

13 12. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants' timekeeping
14 policies and/or practices resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being
15 compensated for all hours actually worked. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees regularly
16 worked more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a workweek. Upon information and
17 belief, Defendants required Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to perform work before their
18 scheduled shifts, after their scheduled shifts, and/or during off-the-clock meal breaks, and failed to
19 compensate aggrieved employees for this time. Upon information and belief, Defendants also failed
20 to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration into the regular rate
21 of pay. Specifically, Defendants utilized an unlawful "rate-in-effect" method for computing the
22 regular rate. As a result, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not compensated for all
23 earned minimum and overtime wages.

24 13. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all
25 legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which have
26 frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes),
27 and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
28 employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed

1 by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate records of Plaintiff's
2 and other non-exempt employees' hours worked, including accurate time records showing when
3 employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt
4 employees were not provided with all legally compliant meal periods to which they were entitled,
5 Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with the required meal
6 period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code
7 § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of
8 meal period premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7 in the event that a legally
9 compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

10 13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take
11 all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices, which failed to
12 authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction
13 thereof. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant rest
14 breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other
15 non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods
16 to which they were entitled, Defendants failed to compensate them with the required rest period
17 premium(s) for each workday there was a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.
18 Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of rest period
19 premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally compliant rest
20 period was not authorized and permitted to their non-exempt employees.

21 14. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants Labor Code § 246 by failing
22 to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration into the paid sick
23 leave pay rate.

24 15. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, failure to
25 pay all meal and rest period premium wages, and unlawful timekeeping and/or payroll practices as
26 alleged above, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage
27 statements to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees. As a further result of Defendants' failure to
28 pay all minimum and overtime wages, paid sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium

wages, Defendants failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and other former non-exempt employees upon their separation of employment from Defendants.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

16. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure:

- a. Minimum Wage Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- b. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who worked more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- c. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who: (i) worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours; and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- d. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 or more hours, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- e. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who received a wage statement, during the one year immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- f. Waiting Time Penalty Class: All of Defendants' formerly employed members of the Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Rest Period Class, and/or Meal Period Class during the three years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

1 17. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The members of the Classes are so numerous that
2 joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The membership of the Classes is
3 unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number
4 greater than 50 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection
5 of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

6 18. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of**
7 **Interest:** There are predominant common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and members of
8 the Classes, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including,
9 without limitation to:

- 10 a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Overtime
11 Class;
- 12 b. Whether Defendants paid at least the minimum wage for all hours worked to
13 members of the Minimum Wage Class;
- 14 c. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period
15 premium wages due to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§
16 226.7 and 512;
- 17 d. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or
18 paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Rest Period Class
19 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
- 20 e. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the
21 Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226; and
- 22 f. Whether Defendants timely paid all final wages to members of the Waiting Time
23 Class at the time of their separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201
24 and 202.

25 These common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and
26 stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member. As
27 such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual
28 class member's showing as to their eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of their damages.

1 19. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because
2 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s)
3 of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein,
4 Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not paid all minimum and overtime wages owed due
5 to Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices, was not provided all required meal periods, was not
6 authorized and permitted all rest periods, did not receive premium pay for non-compliant meal and
7 rest periods, was not paid all final wages upon separation of employment, and was not provided
8 with accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements.

9 20. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps
10 to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's
11 attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes
12 and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have litigated numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and
13 federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the
14 members of the Classes.

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

25 22. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) to pursue an individual remedy
26 would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file
27 an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and
28 permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. The claims of the individual

1 members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution
2 considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending hereto.

3 23. Furthermore, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members,
4 even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
5 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish
6 potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with
7 respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest
8 of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or
9 impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. As such, the Classes identified
10 hereinabove are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 24. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
15 fully set forth herein.

16 25. Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1197, and Wage Order 8, § 4 establish the right of
17 employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state or local law.
18 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal
19 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with
20 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
21 wages and interest accrued thereon. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform its
22 pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the
23 Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked, including, but not limited to, all hours they were
24 subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and
25 Wage Order 8.

26 26. Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under
27 conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code § 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an
28 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those

1 employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount
2 equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

3 27. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of minimum wages, Plaintiff and
4 members of the Minimum Wage Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid wages, including
5 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
6 218.6, 558, 1194, 1194.2, and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§ 3287 and
7 3289.

8 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
9 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
10 **(Against All Defendants)**

11 28. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
12 fully set forth herein.

13 29. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
14 Wage Order 8, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
15 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
16 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

17 30. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
18 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours
19 worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 8. Wage Order 8, § 3 requires an employer
20 to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular rate of pay
21 for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of the Overtime
22 Class to work overtime hours but failed to credit these employees with all overtime hours actually
23 worked.

24 31. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
25 members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime wages, including
26 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
27 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§
28 3287 and 3289.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(Against All Defendants)

32. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods in accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 8, § 11.

34. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of compensation, in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

35. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for meal period violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 8, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(Against All Defendants)

36. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

37. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 8, § 12 and establish the right of employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did not pay these individuals an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

1 38. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
2 members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations
3 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees,
4 and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 8, and Civil Code §§
5 3287 and 3289.

6 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
7 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**
8 **(Against All Defendants)**

9 39. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
10 fully set forth herein.

11 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
12 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff
13 and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
14 that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of pay
15 and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, and/or the correct name and
16 address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of Labor Code § 226.

17 41. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class
18 with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led
19 to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages and meal and rest period
20 premium wages owed and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies
21 in Defendants' reported payroll data.

22 42. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful wage statement practices, Plaintiff and
23 members of the Wage Statement Class seek damages and/or statutory penalties, reasonable
24 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(Against All Defendants)

43. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

44. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of separation of employment in the event the employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit, said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last date of employment.

45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages due to them at their separation from employment, including unpaid minimum and overtime wages as well as unpaid meal and rest period premium wages.

46. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-202.

47. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay Plaintiff and the members of the Waiting Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in continued payment of daily wages up to thirty days from the time the wages were due.

48. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class seek statutory penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 203.

///

///

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 49. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
5 fully set forth herein.

6 50. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business
7 practices in California in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by:

- 8 a. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum
9 wages due;
- 10 b. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages due;
- 11 c. failing to provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal
12 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all meal period premium
13 wages due;
- 14 d. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class all rest
15 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all rest period premium
16 wages due;
- 17 e. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of
18 the Wage Statement Class;
- 19 f. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time
20 Penalty Class; and
- 21 g. failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses to Plaintiff and members of the
22 Expense Reimbursement Class.

23 51. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived
24 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally
25 entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over
26 Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to
27 do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

28 ///

52. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

53. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(Against All Defendants)

54. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

55. Plaintiff, an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*, acting on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees (collectively, “Aggrieved Employees”), brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and § 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100 for each initial violation and \$250 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250 for each initial violation and \$1,000 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code section 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code violations:

/ / /

- a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code § 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- b. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;
- d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;
- e. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;
- g. Failure to reimburse Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802;
- h. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and
- i. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

56. On or about July 27, 2023, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code identified in the preceding paragraph. Now that sixty-five (65) days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

57. Plaintiff has incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;
5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226;
9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203;
10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to

1 pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation
2 pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount
3 unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation
4 pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial violation
5 and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay
6 period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant
7 to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code section 256, a civil
8 penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as waiting time under the terms of
9 Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent
10 violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil
11 penalty is specifically provided;

12 12. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6
13 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

14 13. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§
15 218.5, 226, 1194, and 2699(g); and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

16 14. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

17 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

18 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims.

19
20 DATED: October 1, 2023

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

21
22 By: 

23 Young K. Park
24 William C. Sung
25 Attorneys for Plaintiff ROBERTO TOSCANO
26 HERRERA
27
28