

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

COLDEN KIMBER, CHRISTINE R.
THIEBAUT, and RONALD LANE,
individuals, on behalf of themselves
and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE SPORTS BASEMENT, INC., a
corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-06584-TLT

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION
OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et*
seq.;

2. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN
VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194,
1197 & 1197.1;

3. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN
VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 510;

4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL
PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE
IWC WAGE ORDER;

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST
PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE
IWC WAGE ORDER;

6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF
CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION
OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;

8. FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§
201, 202 AND 203;

9. FAILURE TO PAY SICK PAY WAGES IN
VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB CODE §§201-203,
233, 246; and

10. VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR CODE
§§ 2698, *et seq.*]

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Colden Kimber, Christine R. Thiebaut, and Ronald Lane (“PLAINTIFFS”), on behalf
2 of themselves and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on
3 information and belief, except for their own acts and knowledge, which are based on personal
4 knowledge, the following:

5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. The Sports Basement, Inc. (“DEFENDANT”) is a corporation that at all relevant
7 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

8 2. DEFENDANT is an outdoor gear and apparel store in California.

9 3. Plaintiff Colden Kimber was employed by DEFENDANT in California from
10 October 25, 2021 to June 20, 2023. Plaintiff Kimber was at all times classified by
11 DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally
12 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
13 worked.

14 4. Plaintiff Christine R. Thiebaut was employed by DEFENDANT in California
15 from April 6, 2022 to June 23, 2023. Plaintiff Thiebaut was at all times classified by
16 DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally
17 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
18 worked.

19 5. Plaintiff Ronald Lane was employed by DEFENDANT in California from June
20 2014 to February 2023. Plaintiff Lane was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a
21 non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest
22 periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

23 6. PLAINTIFFS bring this Class Action on behalf of themselves and a California
24 class, defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in
25 California, excluding DEFENDANT’S Presidio location, including any employees staffed with
26 DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning September 25, 2019, and ending on the date
28 as determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy

1 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
2 (\$5,000,000.00).

3 7. PLAINTIFFS bring this Class Action on behalf of themselves and a
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses
5 incurred during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT's policy and
6 practice which failed to lawfully compensate these employees. PLAINTIFFS do not assert any
7 of the claims herein on behalf of DEFENDANT'S employees who worked at the Presidio
8 location, while the employees worked at the Presidio location. DEFENDANT's policy and
9 practice alleged herein was an unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice whereby
10 DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain wages due PLAINTIFFS and the other members
11 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the
13 named PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been
14 economically injured by DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other
15 appropriate legal and equitable relief.

16 8. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
17 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently
18 unknown to PLAINTIFFS who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names
19 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend this Complaint
20 to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are
21 ascertained. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believes, and based upon that information and
22 belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,
23 inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that
24 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

25 9. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting
26 on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the
27 agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct
28 alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein.

1 Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and
2 all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the
4 Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

5 6 **THE CONDUCT**

7 10. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
8 required to pay PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
9 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
10 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires
11 PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the
12 time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires
13 PLAINTIFFS to work while clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFFS' off-duty
14 meal break. PLAINTIFFS was from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked
15 out for what should have been PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter
16 of established company policy and procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the
17 actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members,
18 always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment,
19 PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid less than they would have been
20 paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. Additionally,
21 DEFENDANT engages in the practice of requiring PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 Members to perform work off the clock in that DEFENDANT, as a condition of employment,
23 required these employees to submit to mandatory temperature checks and symptom
24 questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior to clocking into DEFENDANT's timekeeping
25 system for the workday. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
26 forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working
27 without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates.

1 DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

3 11. State and federal law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and
4 rest break premiums at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFFS and
5 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that
6 is tied to specific elements of an employee's performance.

7 12. The second component of PLAINTIFFS' and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members' compensation is DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
9 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
10 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
11 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
12 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate
13 of pay in order to pay overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFFS and other
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation
15 as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay and
16 meal and rest break premium pay. Management and supervisors described the incentive
17 program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of
18 law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in an
20 underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFFS
21 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

22 13. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and other
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off
24 duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFFS and
25 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as
26 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a
27 meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in

1 which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work.
2 DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid paying
3 penalties to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. PLAINTIFFS and other
4 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional
5 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

6 14. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four
8 (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were
9 denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two
10 (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes
11 for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first,
12 second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours
13 or more from time to time. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also
14 not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage
15 Order requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California
16 Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved from all work related
17 duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under
18 California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that
19 employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees
20 spend their time which includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest
21 period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk -
22 five minutes out, five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFFS and
23 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on
24 DEFENDANT's rule which states PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
25 cannot leave the work premises during their rest period.

26 15. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately
27 record and pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual amount
28 of time these employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,

1 DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
2 for all time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of
3 an employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work.
4 DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the
5 time they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have
6 known that PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under
7 compensated for all time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
9 without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent
10 that the time worked off the clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment,
11 DEFENDANT fails to pay minimum wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of
12 Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

13 16. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the
14 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements
15 which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab.
16 Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an
17 accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned
18 and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of
19 time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were paid
20 on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates
21 during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the
22 wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements
23 DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members failed to
24 identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate
25 total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added
26 up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal.
27 Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT
28 failed to issue to PLAINTIFFS an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under

1 California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided
 2 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements
 3 which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

4 17. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be
 5 deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the
 6 wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

7 Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

8 provided in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty
 9 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided
 10 in Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
 11 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each
 employee; (2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional
 violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus
 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

12 18. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and members of the
 13 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll
 14 period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to for the “Hourly”
 15 regular wage payments.

16 19. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFFS and other
 17 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in
 18 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other non-exempt
 19 employees earn non-discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of
 20 pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
 21 Members at their base rates of pay.

22 20. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(l)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
 23 employees be calculated by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime
 24 premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days
 25 of employment.

26 21. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay at
 27 the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members routinely earned
 28 non-discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay. However, when

1 sick pay was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFFS and members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as required under
3 Cal. Lab. Code Section 246.

4 22. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting
6 time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFFS are informed and
7 believe and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful,
8 such that PLAINTIFFS and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has
9 separated are entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

10 23. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer
11 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to
12 said employee." DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFFS and other
13 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, made unlawful deductions from compensation
14 payable to PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, failed to disclose
15 all aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA
16 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at
17 each applicable pay period and upon termination. PLAINTIFFS and members of the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS seek recovery of all illegal deductions from wages
19 according to proof, related penalties, interest, attorney fees and costs.

20 24. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
21 PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses
22 incurred by the PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence
23 of discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section
24 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course
25 and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall
26 indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee
27 in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the
28

1 directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying
2 the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

3 25. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
4 Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal
5 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
6 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated
7 with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically,
8 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to
9 use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with
10 DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS incurred
11 unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use
12 of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

13 26. Specifically as to PLAINTIFFS, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
14 required off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS as required by the applicable Wage
15 Order and Labor Code and failed to pay PLAINTIFFS all minimum and overtime wages due
16 to PLAINTIFFS. DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which provided timely off-
17 duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS and also failed to compensate PLAINTIFFS for
18 PLAINTIFFS' missed meal and rest breaks. The nature of the work performed by the
19 PLAINTIFFS did not prevent PLAINTIFFS from being relieved of all of PLAINTIFFS' duties
20 for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide
21 PLAINTIFFS with the legally required meal periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
22 records. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFFS, each individually, does not exceed the
23 sum or value of \$75,000.

24 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

25 27. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
26 Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This
27
28

1 action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFFS and similarly situated employees
2 of DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

3 28. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
4 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFFS worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
5 DEFENDANT (I) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and facilities
6 in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the
7 wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

8
9 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

10 29. PLAINTIFFS bring the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
11 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as a Class
12 Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as
13 all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, excluding
14 DEFENDANT'S Presidio location, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a
15 third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time
16 during the period beginning September 25, 2019, and ending on the date as determined by the
17 Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). PLAINTIFFS did not work at
18 DEFENDANT'S Presidio location and does not assert any of the claims herein on behalf of
19 DEFENDANT'S employees who worked at the Presidio location, while the employees worked
20 at the Presidio location. The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

22 30. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
24 accordingly.

25 31. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
26 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
27 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
28 wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to record all meal and rest breaks

1 missed by PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though
2 DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and
3 permits or suffers to permit this work.

4 32. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately for all meal and rest breaks missed as
6 required by California laws. The DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of policy and procedure
7 failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in
8 place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid
9 as required by law. This common business practice is applicable to each and every
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair,
11 and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as
12 causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this claim.

13 33. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS Members is impracticable.

15 34. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California
16 law by:

17 (a) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of, Cal. Bus. & Prof.
18 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL"), by unlawfully, unfairly and/or
19 deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures
20 that failed to record and pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked, including minimum wages
22 owed and overtime wages owed for work performed by these employees;
23 and,

24 (b) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by
25 failing to provide the PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

27 35. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
28 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 1 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous
2 that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of
3 their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 4 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues
5 that are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS will apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 7 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS are typical of the claims of
8 each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFFS, like all the
9 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were classified as non-
10 exempt employees paid on an hourly basis who were subjected to the
11 DEFENDANT's deceptive practice and policy which failed to provide the
12 legally required meal and rest periods to the CALIFORNIA CLASS and
13 thereby underpaid compensation to PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS. PLAINTIFFS sustained economic injury as a result of
15 DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFFS and the members
16 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or identically harmed
17 by the same unlawful, deceptive and unfair misconduct engaged in by
18 DEFENDANT; and,
- 19 (d) The representative PLAINTIFFS will fairly and adequately represent and
20 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained
21 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation.
22 There are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative
23 PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would
24 make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 Members.

27 36. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
28 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 1 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
2 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of
3 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
4 create the risk of:
- 5 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
6 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish
7 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
- 9 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be
11 dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the
12 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
13 protect their interests.
- 14 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused to
15 act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, making
16 appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 as a whole in that DEFENDANT failed to pay all wages due to members
18 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;
- 19 1) With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf
20 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to
21 restitution because through this claim PLAINTIFFS seek
22 declaratory relief holding that the DEFENDANT's policy and
23 practices constitute unfair competition, along with declaratory
24 relief, injunctive relief, and incidental equitable relief as may be
25 necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct declared to constitute
26 unfair competition;
- 27 (c) Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of

1 California law as listed above, and predominate over any question
2 affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class
3 Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
4 adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 5 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
6 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate
7 actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will be
8 avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic losses
9 sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when
10 compared to the substantial expense and burden of individual
11 prosecution of this litigation;
- 12 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
13 litigation that would create the risk of:
 - 14 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
15 individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which
16 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
17 DEFENDANT; and/or,
 - 18 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be
20 dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties
21 to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their
22 ability to protect their interests;
- 23 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
24 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting
25 their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which
26 may adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or
27 with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to
28 assert their claims through a representative; and,

1 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
2 and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment
3 will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative
4 litigation that is likely to result in the absence of certification of
5 this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

6 37. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
7 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 8 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
9 predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS Members because the DEFENDANT's employment practices are
11 applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 12 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
13 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial
15 number of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid
16 asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse
17 impact on their employment;
- 18 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is
19 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the
20 Court;
- 21 (d) PLAINTIFFS, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be
22 able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is
23 maintained as a Class Action;
- 24 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
25 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and
26 other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the
27 damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon
28 the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

- (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;
- (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT; and,
- (I) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

38. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify by job title each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

39. PLAINTIFFS further bring the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, excluding DEFENDANT'S Presidio location, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any time during the period beginning September 25, 2020, and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. PLAINTIFFS did not work at DEFENDANT'S Presidio location and does not assert any of the claims herein on behalf of DEFENDANT'S employees who worked at the Presidio location, while the employees worked

1 at the Presidio location. The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

3 40. DEFENDANT, in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare
4 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California
5 law, intentionally, knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed
6 to correctly calculate compensation for the time worked by PLAINTIFFS and the other
7 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and reporting time wages owed to these
8 employees, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees
9 to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT has denied
10 these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members wages to which these employees are
11 entitled in order to unfairly cheat the competition and unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable
12 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against
13 DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
14 accordingly.

15 41. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
16 by name and job title, each of DEFENDANT’s employees who have been intentionally
17 subjected to DEFENDANT’s company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged.
18 PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend the complaint to include any additional job titles of
19 similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

20 42. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

22 43. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
23 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

- 24 (a) Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
25 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS for missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California
27 Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable California Wage
28 Order;

- (b) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide the PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized wage statements;
- (c) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the above-listed conduct;
- (d) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,
- (e) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

44. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS under California law by:

- (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due for overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194;
- (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to accurately pay PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
- (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate itemized statement in writing showing the corresponding correct amount of wages earned by the employee;
- (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with all legally required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required off-duty rest breaks;
- (e) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer

1 must pay the employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to
2 tender full payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner
3 required by California law to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
4 SUB-CLASS who have terminated their employment; and,

- 5 (f) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and
6 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members with necessary
7 expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties.

8 45. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
9 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 10 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are
11 so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
12 Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class
13 will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 14 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues
15 that are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA
16 LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply to every member of the
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 18 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS are typical of the claims of
19 each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
20 PLAINTIFFS, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
21 SUB-CLASS, were non-exempt employees paid on an hourly basis who
22 were subjected to the DEFENDANT's practice and policy which failed to
23 pay the correct amount of wages due to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS. PLAINTIFFS sustained economic injury as a result of
25 DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFFS and the members
26 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or
27 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, and unfair
28 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,

(d) The representative PLAINTIFFS will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members.

46. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

(a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will create the risk of:

1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,

2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.

(b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT fails to pay all wages due. Including the correct wages for

1 all time worked by the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
2 CLASS as required by law;

3 (c) Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and
5 violations of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any
6 question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
7 Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available methods for
8 the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including
9 consideration of:

10 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
11 CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of
12 separate actions in that the substantial expense of individual
13 actions will be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of
14 economic losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA
15 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared to the substantial
16 expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

17 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
18 litigation that would create the risk of:

19 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
20 individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
21 CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of
22 conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,

23 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
24 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical
25 matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members
26 not parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or
27 impede their ability to protect their interests;
28

- 1 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
2 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will
3 avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by
4 DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual's job
5 with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class
6 Action is the only means to assert their claims through a
7 representative; and,
- 8 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
9 and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment
10 will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative
11 litigation that is likely to result in the absence of certification of
12 this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

13 47. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
14 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 15 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
16 SUB-CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
- 18 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
19 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA
20 LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a
21 substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
22 Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of
23 retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- 24 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
25 numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA
26 LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;
- 27
28

- 1 (d) PLAINTIFFS, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
2 Members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress
3 unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;
- 4 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
5 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and
6 other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the
7 damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon
8 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 9 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
10 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of
11 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 12 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable
13 to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-
14 wide relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS as a whole;
- 16 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
17 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA
19 CLASS Members who worked for DEFENDANT in California at any
20 time during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and,
- 21 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring
22 a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour
23 related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the
24 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

For Unlawful Business Practices

[Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*]

(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and Against All Defendants)

48. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

49. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code § 17021.

50. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) defines unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair competition as follows:

Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such unfair competition.

Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code including Sections 204, 210, 221, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802 and the Fair Labor Standards Act and federal regulations promulgated thereunder, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

52. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were unlawful and unfair in that these practices violate public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive,

1 unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or
2 utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section
3 17203 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully
4 withheld.

5 53. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and
6 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's policy and practice failed to provide the legally mandated
7 meal and rest periods, the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest periods
8 and overtime and minimum wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed to reimburse
9 all necessary business expenses incurred, and failed to provide Fair Labor Standards Act
10 overtime wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing to include non-discretionary
11 incentive compensation into their regular rates of pay for purposes of computing the proper
12 overtime pay due to a business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal.
13 Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§
14 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant
15 to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

16 54. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
17 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFFS and
18 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
19 DEFENDANT.

20 55. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
21 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
22 all legally required meal breaks to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

24 56. Therefore, PLAINTIFFS demand on behalf of themselves and on behalf of each
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty
26 meal period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay
27 for each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten
28 (10) hours of work.

1 57. PLAINTIFFS further demand on behalf of themselves and each member of the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off
3 duty paid rest period was not timely provided as required by law.

4 58. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
5 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFFS and the
6 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and
7 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
8 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
9 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

10 59. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial
11 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California
12 Labor Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical,
13 oppressive and unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair and
14 deceptive business practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

15 60. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled
16 to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property
17 which DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and
19 unfair business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

20 61. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
21 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair
22 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from
23 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

24 62. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
25 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices
26 of DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated.
27 As a result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFFS and
28 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer

1 irreparable legal and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to
2 engage in these unlawful and unfair business practices.

3
4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

6 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1]**

7 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

8 **and Against All Defendants)**

9 63. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
11 paragraphs of this Complaint.

12 64. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
13 CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California
14 Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure
15 to accurately calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS
16 Members.

17 65. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and
18 public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

19 66. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
20 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than
21 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

22 67. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages,
23 including minimum wage compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of suit.

24 68. DEFENDANT maintained a wage practice of paying PLAINTIFFS and the other
25 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct amount of
26 time they work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's policy and practice was to unlawfully and
27 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
28 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

1 69. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without
2 limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of
3 implementing a policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the
4 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.

5 70. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
6 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
7 worked by PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
8 DEFENDANT acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other
9 benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission
10 requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

11 71. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
12 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not
13 receive the correct minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

14 72. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT
15 required, permitted or suffered PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
16 Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's
17 control. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and the
18 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked that
19 they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

20 73. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
21 compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
22 CLASS for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic
24 injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained
25 according to proof at trial.

26 74. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and the other
27 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for their time
28 worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance,

1 to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and
2 DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members
3 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wages for their time worked.

4 75. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
5 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for
6 all time worked and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and
7 continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFFS and the other
8 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for
9 their legal rights, or the consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them
10 of their property and legal rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase
11 company profits at the expense of these employees.

12 76. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
13 CLASS therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory
14 costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as
15 provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum
16 wage compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
17 Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor
18 Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time
19 penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein
21 was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA
22 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation

[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]

(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)

77. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though full set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

78. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

79. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

80. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and more than forty (40) hours per workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

81. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages, including minimum wage and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of suit. Cal. Lab. Code § 1198 further states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

82. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required, permitted or suffered by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked, including overtime work.

1 83. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without
2 limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of
3 implementing a policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by
4 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members and denied accurate
5 compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
6 CLASS for overtime worked, including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8)
7 hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any
8 workweek.

9 84. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
10 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
11 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted
12 in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation
13 of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other
14 applicable laws and regulations. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices
15 as alleged herein, the PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
16 SUB-CLASS did not receive full compensation for overtime worked.

17 85. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
18 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the
19 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. Further,
20 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were not
21 subject to a valid collective bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action
22 contained herein this Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFFS bring this Action on behalf of
23 themselves and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS based on DEFENDANT's violations
24 of non-negotiable, non-waiveable rights provided by the State of California.

25 86. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and
26 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have been paid less for
27 overtime worked that they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.
28

1 87. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay the PLAINTIFFS and the other members
2 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which
3 was in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510,
4 1194 & 1198, even though PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
5 SUB-CLASS were required to work, and did in fact work, overtime as to which DEFENDANT
6 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
7 witnessed by employees.

8 88. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
9 compensation to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS for the true amount of time they worked, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic
12 injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained
13 according to proof at trial.

14 89. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and the other
15 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for all overtime
16 worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance,
17 to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and
18 DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members
19 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked.

20 90. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
21 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for
22 all overtime worked and provide them with the requisite overtime compensation, DEFENDANT
23 acted and continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFFS and
24 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with a conscious of and utter
25 disregard for their legal rights, or the consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of
26 depriving them of their property and legal rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order
27 to increase company profits at the expense of these employees.

91. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS therefore request recovery of all overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum and/or overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]

(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)

92. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

93. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide all the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS did not prevent these employees from being relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from time to time not fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally,

DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records from time to time. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

94. DEFENDANT further violates California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a meal period was not provided.

95. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]

(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)

96. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

97. PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10)

1 minute rest periods. Further, these employees from time to time were denied their first rest
 2 periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours,
 3 a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six
 4 (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for
 5 some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFFS and other
 6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages
 7 in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFFS and other
 8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest
 9 periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

10 98. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
 11 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
 12 CLASS Members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage
 13 Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each
 14 workday that rest period was not provided.

15 99. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFFS and
 16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according
 17 to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of
 18 suit.

19 20 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **For Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

22 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]**

23 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
 24 **Defendants)**

25 100. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
 26 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
 27 paragraphs of this Complaint.
 28

1 101. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with
2 an “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- 3 (1) gross wages earned,
- 4 (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation
5 is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under
6 subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
7 Commission,
- 8 (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
9 is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- 10 (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
11 may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- 12 (5) net wages earned,
- 13 (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- 14 (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
15 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an
16 employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on
17 the itemized statement,
- 18 (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- 19 (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
20 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

21 102. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the
22 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with complete and accurate wage
23 statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned.
24 Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees
25 with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages
26 earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
27 amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
28 CLASS Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect
all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable
pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a).
The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA
LABOR SUB-CLASS Members failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage
statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours
shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked
during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed
above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFFS an itemized wage

1 statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result,
 2 DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
 3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code §
 4 226.

5 103. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
 6 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
 7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs
 8 expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of
 9 employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These
 10 damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the
 11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars
 12 (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars
 13 (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in
 14 an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand
 15 dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFFS and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA
 16 LABOR SUB-CLASS herein).

17 18 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **For Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

20 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

21 **(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
 22 **Defendants)**

23 104. PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members
 24 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs
 25 of this Complaint.

26 105. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

27 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures
 28 or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his
 or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even

1 though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions,
2 believed them to be unlawful.

3 106. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by
4 failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
5 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
6 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR
7 SUB-CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to
8 using their personal cellular phones on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.
9 Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
10 required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones and home offices in order to
11 perform work related job tasks. DEFENDANT's policy and practice was to not reimburse
12 PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses resulting
13 from using their personal cellular phones and home offices for DEFENDANT within the course
14 and scope of their employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete
15 their principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any
16 waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by
17 PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed
18 to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
19 members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of
20 California.

21 107. PLAINTIFFS therefore demand reimbursement for expenditures or losses
22 incurred by themselves and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members in the discharge
23 of their job duties for DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT,
24 with interest at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

25 //

26 //

27 //

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Pay Wages When Due

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203]

(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

and Against All Defendants)

108. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

109. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides, in relevant part, that:

As used in this article:

(a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.

(b) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the labor to be paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

110. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, "that If an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately."

111. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

112. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFFS' or any CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' employment contract.

113. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides, in relevant part, that:

If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or

1 until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for
2 more than 30 days.

3 114. The employment of PLAINTIFFS and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
4 CLASS Members has terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages
5 owed as required by law. Additionally, at all times during the term of PLAINTIFFS'
6 employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
7 Members earned and accrued vested vacation and holiday time on the date of their termination
8 pursuant to DEFENDANT's uniform vacation policies and applicable California law. The
9 amount of vacation pay PLAINTIFFS and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
10 Members earned and accumulated is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.
11 Additionally, DEFENDANT also underpaid accrued vested vacation wages to PLAINTIFFS
12 and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS by failing to pay such wages at
13 the regular rate of pay and more specifically the final rate of pay that included all non-
14 discretionary incentive compensation. Rather than pay vacation wages at the regular rate of
15 pay, DEFENDANT underpaid vacation wages to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA
16 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members at their base rates of pay, instead of including all of
17 PLAINTIFFS' and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' non-discretionary
18 incentive compensation into the vacation wage payment calculations. DEFENDANT failed to
19 specify in DEFENDANT's written vacation policy the rate at which PLAINTIFFS and other
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR CLASS Members would be paid vacation upon leaving employment
21 with DEFENDANT. As a result of DEFENDANT's unlawful practice, policy and procedure to
22 deny paying the PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
23 CLASS all of their vested vacation and holiday time, DEFENDANT failed to pay the
24 PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all vested vacation
25 time as wages due upon employment termination, in violation of the California Labor Code,
26 Sections 201, 202, 203 and 227.3. Similarly, DEFENDANT underpaid waiting time penalties
27 to PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members at their base rates
28 of pay, instead of including all of PLAINTIFFS' and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

Members' non-discretionary compensation into the waiting time penalty calculations. This failure by DEFENDANT is believed to be the result of DEFENDANT's unlawful, unfair and deceptive refusal to provide compensation for earned, accrued and vested vacation and holiday time, as well as the corresponding waiting time penalties that were paid. DEFENDANT perpetrated this unlawful, unfair and deceptive practice to the detriment of the PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. DEFENDANT's uniform practice and policy of failing to pay the LABOR SUB-CLASS Members for all vested vacation and holiday time accumulated at employment termination violated and continues to violate Section 227.3 of the California Labor Code.

115. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of themselves and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has terminated and who have not been fully paid their wages due to them, PLAINTIFFS demand thirty days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD and demand an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 210, 233, 246]

(By PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

and Against All Defendants)

116. PLAINTIFFS, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

117. Cal Lab. Code § 233 provides that an employer must permit an employee to use accrued sick leave in accordance with Cal Lab. Code § 246.5 at the employee's then current rate of entitlement. Cal Lab. Code § 246 provides that an employee is entitled to sick pay wages for use of accrued sick leave pursuant to Cal Lab. Code § 246.5. Specifically, once accrued sick

1 leave is used as paid sick time, an employee has a vested right to sick pay wages, which an
2 employer must calculate and compensate based on one of two calculations: (I) “Paid sick time
3 for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for
4 the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually
5 works overtime in that workweek,” or (ii) “Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be
6 calculated by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the
7 employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.”
8 Under Cal Lab. Code §§ 218 and 233, employees may sue to recover underpaid sick pay wages
9 as damages.

10 118. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to
11 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS at the
12 incorrect rate of pay. PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-
13 SUB-CLASS regularly use accrued sick leave in the workweeks in which they also earn non-
14 hourly remuneration. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages
15 to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS at the
16 base hourly pay, as opposed to the regular rate of pay, which would consider all non-hourly
17 remuneration in addition to base hourly wages, or the rate resulting from dividing the
18 employee’s total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee’s total hours
19 worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. As a result, DEFENDANT
20 underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
21 LABOR-SUB-CLASS.

22 119. Code § 246 specifically requires that, upon use of accrued sick leave, vested sick
23 pay wages are due and to be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period
24 after accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides that
25 if an employer discharges an employee, wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
26 due and payable immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides that an employee is entitled to
27 receive all unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an employee quits his or her employment,
28 unless the employee has given 72-hour notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the

1 employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes
2 untimely payments. For example, Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully
3 fails to pay wages owed in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the wages of the
4 employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date, and at the same rate until paid, but the
5 wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days. Likewise, Cal. Lab. Code § 210
6 provides penalties for untimely payments during employment. Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203,
7 210 and 218, employees may sue to recover applicable penalties.

8 120. As alleged herein and as a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT routinely
9 underpays sick pay wages and thus did not timely pay PLAINTIFFS and the other members of
10 the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all owing and underpaid sick pay wages. As a result,
11 DEFENDANT violates Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 210, 233, and 246, among other Labor
12 Code provisions. PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe that DEFENDANT was advised by
13 skilled lawyers and knew, or should have known, of the mandates of the Labor Code as it
14 relates to PLAINTIFFSs allegations, especially since the California Supreme Court has
15 explained that “[c]ourts have recognized that ‘wages’ also include those benefits to which an
16 employee is entitled as a part of his or her compensation, including money, room, board,
17 clothing, vacation pay, and sick pay.” *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1094,
18 1103 (2007)(emphasis added). Because DEFENDANT willfully fails to timely pay
19 PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all sick pay
20 wages due, DEFENDANT is subject to applicable penalties.

21 121. Such a pattern, practice, and uniform administration of corporate policy is
22 unlawful and entitles PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-
23 SUB-CLASS to underpaid sick pay wages, including interest thereon, applicable penalties,
24 attorney’s fees, and costs of suit.

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*]

(By Plaintiff Kimber and Against All Defendants)

122. Plaintiff Kimber realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

123. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

124. Plaintiff Kimber, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to himself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of July 5, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

125. On July 5, 2023, Plaintiff Kimber gave written notice by electronic mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein (*PAGA Notice only without draft complaint*). The statutory waiting period for Plaintiff Kimber

1 to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3,
 2 Plaintiff Kimber may now pursue a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section
 3 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
 4 as herein defined.

5 126. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
 6 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide Plaintiff Kimber and the
 7 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly record
 8 and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages, (d) failed
 9 to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for required
 10 expenses, (f) failed to provide wages when due, and (g) failed to provide suitable seating, all
 11 in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204
 12 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
 13 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B),
 14 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and
 15 the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such
 16 conduct.¹ Plaintiff Kimber hereby seeks recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor
 17 Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California for
 18 the illegal conduct perpetrated on Plaintiff Kimber and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

19 127. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA
 20 PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect
 21 Plaintiff Kimber during the PAGA PERIOD, Plaintiff Kimber seeks penalties for those
 22 violations that affected the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks*
 23 *Corp.* 2018 AJDAR 12157 (Certified for Publication 12/19/18).

24 //

25 //

27 ¹Plaintiffs specifically exclude and/or do not allege any claims under California Labor
 28 Code §558(a)(3).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS pray for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- A) That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- B) An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
- C) An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and,
- D) Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to PLAINTIFFS and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:

- A) That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- B) Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFFS and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- C) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;

- 1 D) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
2 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 3 E) For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and
4 1197;
- 5 F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFFS and each member of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties,
7 plus interest, and costs of suit.; and,
- 8 G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR
9 SUB-CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or
10 until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 11 3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
12 EMPLOYEES:
- 13 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys
14 General Act of 2004.
- 15 4. On all claims:
- 16 A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
17 B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,
18 C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the
19 law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §221, §226, §1194,
20 and/or §2802.
- 21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: September 13, 2024

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE
BLOUW LLP

2
3
4 By: */s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw*

5 Norman B. Blumenthal
6 Nicholas J. De Blouw

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFFS demand a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

Dated: September 13, 2024 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE
BLOUW LLP

By: */s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw*

Norman B. Blumenthal
Nicholas J. De Blouw

Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS

EXHIBIT 1

2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:
Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:
1004

July 5, 2023
CA 3007

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

The Sports Basement, Inc.
Certified Mail #9589071052700182373159
ERIC PROSNITZ
610 OLD MASON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94129

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 et seq., 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by The Sports Basement, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with The Sports Basement, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 5, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Colden Kimber (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against The Sports Basement, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed from October 25, 2021 to June 20, 2023 by Defendant in California. Plaintiff was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal.

App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.