

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan (SBN 320389)
E-mail: lilit@moonlawgroup.com
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff Juan Marchell King

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
7/27/2023 4:13 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By J. Nunez, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

JUAN MARCHELL KING, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL FOOD BANK, a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: **23STCV17761**

CLASS 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.].

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	16
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	17
EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION	19
PRAYER FOR RELIEF	22
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	26

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

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

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

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

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

23 4. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants
24 maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 25 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
26 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
27 and IWC Wage Orders;
28

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

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

6. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Class. 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

7. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, as a forklift operator from approximately May 2016 to August 2022.

8. 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

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Los Angeles Regional Food Bank is:

- (a) A California corporation with its principal places 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; and
- (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Class to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

10. 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 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.

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

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and

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

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

13 13. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Los
14 Angeles, State of California, as a forklift operator during the statutory period. During the
15 statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California overtime laws,
16 and paid Plaintiff and the Class an hourly rate of pay.

17 14. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
18 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
19 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
20 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all
21 final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
22 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
23 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

24 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
25 not paying Plaintiff and the Class for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiff
26 and the Class received non-discretionary bonuses, COVID incentives, and other remuneration.
27 However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct
28 overtime rate of pay, sick day rate of pay, and meal break premium rate of pay, leading to

1 underpayment to Plaintiff and the Class. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the
2 Class were required to work “off the clock” and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the
3 Class were required to wait for a supervisor to open the gate for the parking entrance, and wait
4 for the supervisor to open the entrance to the warehouse, which was off the clock and
5 uncompensated. Plaintiff and the Class were also instructed to get the forklift before clocking
6 into work. Plaintiff and the Class were also required to wait in line in order to clock into work,
7 off the clock and uncompensated. Plaintiff and the Class were required to show up to work early
8 in order to complete these and other items prior to clocking into work, and prior to the scheduled
9 shift. Also throughout the statutory period, Defendants did not pay all wages owed, including
10 premiums. For example, on July 16, 2021, the wage statement for Plaintiff shows that Plaintiff’s
11 meal break premium was paid at a lower rate than the base rate, leading to underpayment to
12 Plaintiff and the Class. Also throughout the statutory period, Defendants sometimes altered pay
13 timeclocks in order to reduce the hours worked, reflected in rounded hours in wage statements.

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

27 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
28 and permit Plaintiff and the Class to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants

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

14 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the
15 Class to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants without
16 reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff and the Class were required to use their own personal
17 cellular telephones for work purposes without sufficient reimbursement. Plaintiff and the Class
18 were also required to maintain their own uniforms without reimbursement.

19 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
20 pay Plaintiff and the Class at the conclusion of their employment all wages for all minimum
21 wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages.

22 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
23 Class with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross
24 and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked,
25 correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in
26 accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and
27 permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address). Further, the wage
28 statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As a result of these

violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Class suffered injury because, among other things:

- (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were entitled;
- (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;
- (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were;
- (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;
- (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages rates to which Plaintiff and the Class were entitled, and Plaintiff and the

1 Class were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were
2 entitled.

3 Thus, Plaintiff and the Class are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code §
4 226(e), including actual damages.

5 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

6 21. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all
7 other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil
8 Procedure § 382.

9 22. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief
10 authorized by California law.

11 23. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

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

15 24. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

16 25. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
17 conditions of all Class Members.

18 26. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is
19 readily ascertainable:

20 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
21 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
22 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
23 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the
24 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
25 Defendants' records.

26 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
27 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
28

defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

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

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

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

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former

1 employers might damage their future endeavors through negative
2 references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members
3 who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows
4 for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is
5 protected.

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

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

23 28. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
24 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- 25 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
26 question affecting only individual members;
- 27 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
28 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;

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

25 29. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
26 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own
27 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the
28 contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would

1 contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as
2 published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by
3 other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

6 30. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
7 paragraphs 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

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

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

16 33. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages for all
17 non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

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

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

25 36. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
26 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
27 compensation due Plaintiff and the Class.
28

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

38. 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 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 all such wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

39. Plaintiff and the Class 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)

40. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

41. 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.

42. 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.

43. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

44. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class

1 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
2 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198. Plaintiff and the Class
3 are regularly required to work overtime hours.

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

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

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

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

21 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

23 49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
24 paragraphs 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

25 50. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the
26 Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the
27 start of Plaintiff and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal
28 periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the

1 California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer
2 provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a
3 violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee
4 to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

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

11 52. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
12 additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s),
13 plus interest thereon.

14 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

16 53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
17 paragraphs 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

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

27 55. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the
28 Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than 4 hours in a

1 workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as
2 alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take
3 these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of
4 the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

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

8 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

10 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
11 paragraphs 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

12 58. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by
13 failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff and the Class for their necessary expenditures and
14 losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to
15 directions of Defendants.

16 59. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of the
17 expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

18 60. Plaintiff and the class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and
19 costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code section
20 2802(b).

21 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time** 23 **Penalties)**

24 61. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
25 paragraphs 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

26 62. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
27 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
28 due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment,

1 his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter,
2 unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to
3 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

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

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

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

18 66. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally
19 accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days
20 maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

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

24 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and** 26 **Compliant Wage Records)**

27 68. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
28 paragraphs 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

69. 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.

70. 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, the failure to list the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

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

72. 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).

73. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class 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.

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

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

4
5
6
7 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

10 76. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
11 paragraphs 1 through 20 in this Complaint.

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

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

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

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

27 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

28 81. 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

82. 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

83. 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

84. 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

85. 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.*

Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses

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

Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

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

88. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices

described herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

89. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

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

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

92. 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.

93. 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.

94. 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.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

Class Certification

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

As to the First Cause of Action

4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all minimum wages due;
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;
7. For liquidated damages;
8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due;

- 1 11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;
- 2 12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
- 3 from the date such amounts were due;
- 4 13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
- 5 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
- 6 14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

7 As to the Third Cause of Action

- 8 15. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
- 9 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
- 10 16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;
- 11 17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
- 12 such amounts were due;
- 13 18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
- 14 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 15 19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

16 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

- 17 20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
- 18 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
- 19 21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;
- 20 22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
- 21 such amounts were due;
- 22 23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
- 23 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 24 24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

25 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

- 26 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
- 27 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;
- 28

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

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

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

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

7 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

17 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

26 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

27 40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
28 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked

(including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

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

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

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

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

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

As to all Causes of Action

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

Dated: July 27, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

By: _____


Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

Dated: July 27, 2023

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

By: 

Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Attorneys for Plaintiff