

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff IRENE EUNHEE IKUTA

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT**IRENE EUNHEE IKUTA, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

TAKEE INTERNATIONAL, INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through
50,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23STCV21120

**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

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

09/29/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: K. Martinez Deputy

1 Plaintiff IRENE EUNHEE IKUTA (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all others similarly
2 situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint
3 (“Complaint”) against Defendants TAKEE INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California corporation, and
4 DOES 1 to 150 inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as
5 follows:

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself 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, 1182.12, 1194,
10 1194.2, 1197, 1198, and 2698, *et seq.*; and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 5-
11 2001 (“Wage Order 5”), in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution.
12 This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has
13 jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy
14 exceeds \$25,000.

15 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants are headquartered in,
16 maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including Los
17 Angeles County, and some of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles
18 County.

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 restaurant
23 manager. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or customs
24 complained of herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions
25 Code § 17200, *et. seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12,
26 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2698, *et seq.*, and Wage Order 5.

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 Defendants engage in and continue to engage in the operation and management of restaurants, and
2 employed Plaintiff and other, similarly-situated non-exempt employees within the State of
3 California and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in the State of California.

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

13 6. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
14 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,
15 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
16 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
17 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

18 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
19 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
20 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within
21 the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent
22 said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining
23 Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

24 8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were members of, and
25 engaged in, a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and
26 scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise.

27 ///

28 ///

1 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
2 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
3 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged.

4 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 10. Defendants own and operate Japanese restaurants in the State of California. Plaintiff
6 began working for Defendants as a non-exempt restaurant manager at one of its restaurants named
7 Izakaya Hachi in Torrance, California from approximately February 17, 2022 to May 11, 2023.

8 11. Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies and/or practices resulted in Plaintiff
9 and other non-exempt employees not being compensated for all hours actually worked. Plaintiff and
10 other non-exempt employees regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday or forty hours in
11 a workweek. Upon information and belief, Defendants engaged in unlawful rounding and time-
12 shaving of employees' time records, automatically deducted meal periods, and directed employees
13 to work prior to clocking in, after clocking out, and during meal periods. Upon information and
14 belief, prior to approximately September 2022, Defendants compensated Plaintiff and other non-
15 exempt employees on a salary basis regardless of the number of hours worked and failed to pay
16 them overtime compensation when they worked more than eight hours in a workday or forty hours
17 in a workweek. Upon information and belief, Defendants compensated Plaintiff and other non-
18 exempt employees with non-discretionary incentive compensation, such as "Auto Expense", and
19 failed into factor the incentive into the regular rate of pay for overtime. As a result, Plaintiff and
20 other non-exempt employees were not compensated for all earned minimum and overtime wages.

21 12. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all
22 legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which have
23 frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes),
24 and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
25 employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed
26 by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate records of Plaintiff's
27 and other non-exempt employees' hours worked, including accurate time records showing when
28 employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff was not provided with all

1 legally compliant meal periods to which he was entitled, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff
2 with the required meal period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as
3 mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no
4 mechanism for the payment of meal period premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7,
5 in the event that a legally compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

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

17 14. Defendants have a policy and practice to provide paid sick leave to Plaintiff and
18 other non-exempt employees on the 13th month after their employment start date at the accrual rate
19 of three days every six months worked and failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt
20 employees with a written notice that set forth the amount of paid sick leave available for use in
21 violation of Labor Code § 246.

22 15. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, paid sick
23 leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll
24 records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees.
25 Furthermore, Defendants' wage statements issued to employees failed to identify paid sick leave
26 accrual and identify erroneous paycodes, such as "Rent Allowance" and "TIP NRE".

27 16. As a further result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages,
28 paid sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to timely pay all

1 final wages to Plaintiff and other former employees upon their separation of employment from
2 Defendants.

3 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

- 6 a. Minimum Wage Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants
7 in the State of California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies
8 and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action
9 through the present.
- 10 b. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the
11 State of California who worked more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40)
12 hours per week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or
13 practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action
14 through the present.
- 15 c. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
16 the State of California who: (i) worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours;
17 and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours, during the four years
18 immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 19 d. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
20 the State of California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 or more hours, during the
21 four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 22 e. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants
23 in the State of California who received a wage statement, during the one year
24 immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 25 f. Waiting Time Penalty Class: All of Defendants' formerly employed members of the
26 Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Rest Period Class, and/or Meal Period Class
27 during the three years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the
28 present.

1 18. **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 fifty (50) individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via
5 inspection of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

6 19. **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 20. **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 21. **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 and settled numerous wage-and-hour class actions
13 in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on
14 behalf of the members of the Classes.

15 22. **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 23. 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 24. 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 25. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
15 fully set forth herein.

16 26. Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1197, and Wage Order 5, § 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 5.

26 27. 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. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
3 alleges, that Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class to work hours
4 but failed to compensate these employees for all hours actually worked.

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

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
12 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

15 30. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
16 Wage Order 5, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
17 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
18 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

19 31. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
20 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours
21 worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 5. Wage Order 5, § 3 requires an employer
22 to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular rate of pay
23 for overtime and double time hours work. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon
24 alleges, that Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class to work overtime
25 hours but failed to compensate these employees for all overtime hours actually worked.

26 32. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
27 members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime premiums,
28 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor

Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 218.5, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(Against All Defendants)

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

34. 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 5, § 11.

35. 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.

36. 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 5, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(Against All Defendants)

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

38. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 5, § 12 and establish the right of employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) 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

1 an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to
2 authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

3 39. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
4 members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations
5 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees,
6 and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 5, and Civil Code §§
7 3287 and 3289.

8 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
9 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**
10 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

45. 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.

46. 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, paid sick leave, as well as meal and rest period premium wages.

47. 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.

48. 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.

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

6 51. 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; and
- 19 f. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time
20 Penalty Class.

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

26 53. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged
27 herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of
28 monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired

1 and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

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

4 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

6 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

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

25 a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Aggrieved Employees in
26 violation of Labor Code § 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;

27 b. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation
28 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 provide Aggrieved Employees with paid sick leave in violation of Labor Code § 246;
- f. Failing to provide Aggrieved Employees with a written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available in violation of Labor Code § 246;
- g. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- h. 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;
- i. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and
- j. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

57. On or about July 25, 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.

58. Plaintiff has incurred attorneys’ fees and costs, which she is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 4 1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
- 5 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
- 6 3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
- 7 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated
8 damages, and statutory penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194,
9 1194.2, and 1197;
- 10 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and statutory
11 penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 12 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof
13 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
- 14 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof
15 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
- 16 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
17 226;
- 18 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
19 203;
- 20 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the
21 Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or
22 practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
23 *seq.*;
- 24 11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other Aggrieved
25 Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and
26 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to
27 pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation
28 pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount

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

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

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

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

15 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

17
18 DATED: September 29, 2023

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

19
20 By: 

21 Young K. Park

22 William C. Sung

23 Attorneys for Plaintiff IRENE EUNHEE IKUTA
24
25
26
27
28