

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

Young K. Park, SB# 287589

E-Mail: young@justiceforworkers.com

William C. Sung, SB# 280792

E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com

3600 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1815

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Tel: 323-922-2000

Fax: 323-922-2000

Attorneys for Plaintiff LAN THANH LUU

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE, CIVIL COMPLEX CENTER

LAN THANH LUU, an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

GARDEN GROVE SUPERSTORE INC., a
California corporation; TRAN'S GROUP,
INC., a California corporation; EL MONTE
SUPERSTORE INC., a California corporation;
SHUN FAT SUPERMARKET INC., a
California corporation; WESTMINSTER
SUPERSTORE, LLC, a California limited
liability company; SF SAN DIEGO INC., a
California corporation; SAN PABLO
SUPERMARKET, INC., a California
corporation; STOCKTON SUPERMARKET,
INC., a California corporation; SF
SUPERMARKET FRESNO, INC., a
California corporation; SF SUPERMARKET,
Inc., a California corporation; and DOES 1
through 50,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2023-01351037-CU-OE-CXC

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

- (1) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);**
- (2) **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194,
1198);**
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);**
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);**
- (5) **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE § 226);**
- (6) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);**
- (7) **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE
NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES
(LABOR CODE § 2802);**
- (8) **UNLAWFUL DEDUCTIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 221 AND 1198);**
- (9) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*);**
- (10) **FAILURE TO PERMIT
INSPECTION OF EMPLOYMENT**

**RECORDS (LABOR CODE §§ 1198.5
& 226(b)); AND
(11) CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
CALIFORNIA PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff LAN THANH LUU (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants GARDEN GROVE SUPERSTORE INC., a California corporation; TRAN’S GROUP, INC., a California corporation; EL MONTE SUPERSTORE INC., a California corporation; SHUN FAT SUPERMARKET INC., a California corporation; WESTMINSTER SUPERSTORE, LLC, a California limited liability company; SF SAN DIEGO INC., a California corporation; SAN PABLO SUPERMARKET, INC., a California corporation; STOCKTON SUPERMARKET, INC., a California corporation; SF SUPERMARKET FRESNO, INC., a California corporation; SF SUPERMARKET, Inc., a California corporation; and DOES 1 to 50 inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 212, 221, 226, 226.7, 246, 432, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 7-2001 (“Wage Order 7”), in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution. This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds \$25,000.

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

1 employed by Defendants within Orange County.

2 **PARTIES**

3 3. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant herein was, an individual over the age of
4 eighteen (18) and is a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to
5 each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee.
6 Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants' policies, practices, and/or customs complained of
7 herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et*
8 *seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 212, 221, 226, 226.7, 246, 432, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194,
9 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and Wage Order 7.

10 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
11 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,
12 Defendants did, and continue to do, business in the State of California by operating an Asian
13 supermarket chain under the brand name "Shun Fat Supermarket" and "SF Supermarket" with 11
14 supermarkets in California. See <https://shunfatsupermarket.com/locations/>. Defendants employed
15 Plaintiff and other, similarly-situated non-exempt employees within Orange County, and the State
16 of California and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in Orange County and the State of
17 California.

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

27 6. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
28 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,

1 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
2 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
3 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

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

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

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

16 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

17 10. Defendants own and operate an Asian supermarket chain under the brand name
18 “Shun Fat Supermarket” and “SF Supermarket” with 11 supermarkets in California. Plaintiff began
19 working for Defendants as a non-exempt cashier at their Garden Grove Superstore supermarket in
20 Garden Grove, California from approximately January 2022 to approximately October 2022.

21 11. Throughout Plaintiff’s employment with Defendants, Defendants’ timekeeping
22 and/or payroll policies and practices resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being
23 compensated for all hours actually worked. Defendants’ non-exempt employee sometimes worked
24 more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a week. Upon information and belief, Defendant
25 failed to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees wages for all hours worked, including
26 during the first two weeks of on-the-job training. Upon information and belief, Defendants also
27 unlawfully deducted wages from Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for cash shortages and
28 counterfeit currency they received. As a result, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not

1 compensated for all earned minimum and overtime wages.

2 12. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all
3 legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which have
4 frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes),
5 and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
6 employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed
7 by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate records of Plaintiff's
8 and other non-exempt employees' hours worked, including accurate time records showing when
9 employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt
10 employees were not provided with all legally compliant meal periods to which they were entitled,
11 Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with the required meal
12 period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code
13 § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of
14 meal period premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7 in the event that a legally
15 compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

16 13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take
17 all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices, which failed to
18 authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction
19 thereof. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant rest
20 breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. Additionally, although Plaintiff and other
21 non-exempt employees occasionally worked shifts in excess of 10 hours, Plaintiff and other non-
22 exempt employees were not authorized and permitted a third rest period during shifts in excess of
23 10 hours. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized
24 and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods to which they were entitled, Defendants
25 failed to compensate them with the required rest period premium(s) for each workday there was a
26 rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants
27 maintained no mechanism for the payment of rest period premium payments as required by Labor
28 Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally compliant rest period was not authorized and permitted to

1 their non-exempt employees.

2 14. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to provide non-exempt
3 employees with paid sick leave and failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with
4 a written notice that set forth the amount of paid sick leave available for use in violation of Labor
5 Code § 246.

6 15. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, failure to
7 pay all meal and rest period premium wages, and unlawful timekeeping and payroll practices as
8 alleged above, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage
9 statements to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees. Moreover, Defendants' wage statements
10 issued to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees failed to state the address of the legal entity that
11 was their employer. As a further result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime
12 wages, sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to timely pay
13 all final wages to Plaintiff and other former non-exempt employees upon their separation of
14 employment from Defendants.

15 16. Additionally, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were forced to incur
16 necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants,
17 including, but not limited to, purchasing counterfeit detector pens to reduce the instances of
18 Defendants unlawfully deducting their wages.

19 17. On August 18, 2023, Plaintiff submitted a request for inspection or copy of her
20 personnel file, payroll and time records, and all documents she signed relating to the obtaining or
21 holding of employment under Labor Code §§ 226(b), 432, and 1198.5 to Defendant GARDEN
22 GROVE SUPERSTORE INC. via certified mail. As of the date of this Complaint, Defendant
23 GARDEN GROVE SUPERSTORE INC. has failed to permit Plaintiff to inspect or copy her
24 employment records.

25 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

28 ///

- 1 a. Minimum Wage Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants
2 in the State of California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies
3 and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action
4 through the present.
- 5 b. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the
6 State of California who worked more than eight hours per day and/or 40 hours per
7 week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices, during
8 the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 9 c. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
10 the State of California who: (i) worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours;
11 and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours, during the four years
12 immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 13 d. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
14 the State of California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 or more hours, during the
15 four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 16 e. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants
17 in the State of California who received a wage statement, during the one year
18 immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 19 f. Waiting Time Penalty Class: All of Defendants' formerly employed members of the
20 Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Rest Period Class, and/or Meal Period Class
21 during the three years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the
22 present.
- 23 g. Expense Reimbursement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of
24 Defendants in the State of California who were not reimbursed for all necessary
25 business expenses, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this
26 action through the present.
- 27 h. Unlawful Deduction Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of
28 Defendants in the State of California whose wages were deducted due to cash

1 shortages or receipt of counterfeit currency, during the four years immediately
2 preceding the filing of this action through the present.

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

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

- 12 a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Overtime
13 Class;
- 14 b. Whether Defendants paid at least the minimum wage for all hours worked to
15 members of the Minimum Wage Class;
- 16 c. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period
17 premium wages due to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§
18 226.7 and 512;
- 19 d. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or
20 paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Rest Period Class
21 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
- 22 e. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the
23 Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226;
- 24 f. Whether Defendants reimbursed members of the Expense Reimbursement Class for
25 all necessary business expenses pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;
- 26 g. Whether Defendants unlawfully deducted the wages of members of the Unlawful
27 Deduction Class in violation of Labor Code §§ 212 and 1198; and
- 28 h. Whether Defendants timely paid all final wages to members of the Waiting Time

1 Class at the time of their separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201
2 and 202.

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

7 21. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because
8 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s)
9 of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein,
10 Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not paid all minimum and overtime wages owed due
11 to Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices, was not provided all required meal periods, was not
12 authorized and permitted all rest periods, did not receive premium pay for non-compliant meal and
13 rest periods, was not paid all final wages upon separation of employment, was not provided with
14 accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements, experienced unlawful deduction of wages, and was
15 not reimbursed for all necessary business expenses.

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

22 23. **Superiority:** The Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important
23 public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws
24 and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who
25 have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic
26 and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this
27 action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class
28 action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged

1 herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily
2 gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited
3 resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

4 24. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) to pursue an individual remedy
5 would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file
6 an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and
7 permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. The claims of the individual
8 members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution
9 considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending hereto.

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

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

20 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

23 27. Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1197, and Wage Order 7, § 4 establish the right of
24 employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state or local law.
25 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal
26 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with
27 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
28 wages and interest accrued thereon. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform its

1 pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the
2 Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked, including, but not limited to, all hours they were
3 subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and
4 Wage Order 7.

5 28. Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under
6 conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code § 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an
7 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those
8 employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount
9 equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

10 29. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of minimum wages, Plaintiff and
11 members of the Minimum Wage Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid wages, including
12 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
13 218.6, 558, 1194, 1194.2, and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§ 3287 and
14 3289.

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
16 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
17 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

20 31. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
21 Wage Order 7, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
22 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
23 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

24 32. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
25 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours
26 worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 7. Wage Order 7, § 3 requires an employer
27 to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular rate of pay
28 for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of the Overtime

1 Class to work overtime hours but failed to compensate these employees with all overtime hours
2 actually worked.

3 33. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
4 members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime wages, including
5 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
6 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§
7 3287 and 3289.

8 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

10 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

13 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
14 in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including
15 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods in
16 accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 7, § 11.

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

20 37. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiff and
21 members of the Meal Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for meal period
22 violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code
23 §§ 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 7, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

24 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

1 39. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 7, § 12 and establish the right of
2 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period
3 worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
4 despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class
5 to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did not pay these individuals
6 an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to
7 authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

8 40. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
9 members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations
10 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees,
11 and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 7, and Civil Code §§
12 3287 and 3289.

13 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**

15 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

4 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

6 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 203.

2 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES**

4 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

7 52. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2802, which
8 states that “an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or
9 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his
10 or obedience to the directions of the employer.”

11 53. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and
12 members of the Expense Reimbursement Class all necessary business expenses they incurred in the
13 performance of their job duties.

14 54. As a consequence of Defendants’ unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the
15 class seek recovery of unreimbursed business expenses, including interest thereon, reasonable
16 attorneys’ fees, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802.

17 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **UNLAWFUL DEDUCTIONS**

19 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

22 56. Labor Code section 221 prohibits any employer from collecting or receiving from an
23 employee any part of wages paid by said employer to said employee.

24 57. Labor Code section 1198 provides: “The employment of any employee ... under
25 conditions of labor prohibited by the [Industrial Wage Orders] is unlawful.” Wage Order 7, Section
26 8, provide: “No employer shall make any deduction from the wage or require any reimbursement
27 from an employee for any cash shortage, breakage, or loss of equipment, unless it can be shown that
28 the shortage, breakage, or loss is caused by a dishonest or willful act, or by the gross negligence of

1 the employee.”

2 58. During the relevant time period, Defendants deducted wages from Plaintiff and
3 members of the Unlawful Deduction Class for cash shortages and counterfeit currency they
4 received.

5 59. As a consequence of Defendants’ unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the
6 class seek recovery of wages unlawfully deducted, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys’
7 fees, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code §§ 212, 1198, and Wage Order 7.

8 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

10 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

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

- 15 a. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum
16 wages due;
- 17 b. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages due;
- 18 c. failing to provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal
19 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all meal period premium
20 wages due;
- 21 d. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class all rest
22 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all rest period premium
23 wages due;
- 24 e. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of
25 the Wage Statement Class;
- 26 f. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time
27 Penalty Class;
- 28 g. unlawfully deducted wages due to Plaintiff and members of the Unlawful Deduction

1 Class; and
2 h. failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses to Plaintiff and members of the
3 Expense Reimbursement Class.

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

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

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

15 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO PERMIT INSPECTION OF EMPLOYMENT RECORDS**

17 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

20 66. Labor Code § 226 requires an employer to "afford current and former employees the
21 right to inspect or copy records pertaining to their employment" within 21 calendars from the date
22 of the request; provides that "a failure by an employer to permit a current or former employee to
23 inspect or copy records within the time set forth . . . entitles the current or former employee . . . to
24 recover a seven-hundred-fifty-dollar (\$750) penalty from the employer"; and authorizes recovery of
25 attorneys' fees and costs.

26 67. Labor Code § 1198.5 requires an employer to "make the contents of . . . personnel
27 records available for inspection to the current or former employee, or his or her representative, at
28 reasonable intervals and at reasonable times, but not later than 30 calendar days from the date the

1 employer receives a written request . . .”; provides that the failure to comply with this statute
2 entitles the employee to recover a penalty of \$750; and authorizes recovery of attorneys’ fees and
3 costs.

4 68. Defendants failed to permit Plaintiff to inspect or copy records pertaining to her
5 employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5. As a consequence of Defendants’
6 unlawful practices, Plaintiff and seek statutory penalties, attorneys’ fees, and costs of suit according
7 to Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5.

8 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

10 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

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

- a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code § 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- b. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;
- d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;
- e. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;
- g. Failure to reimburse Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802;
- h. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204;
- i. Unlawfully deducting the wages of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 212 and 1198;
- j. Failure to permit inspection of employment records in violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 432, 1198.5; and
- k. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

71. On or about August 18 and August 21, 2023, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code

1 identified in the preceding paragraph. Plaintiff's PAGA notice specifically advised Defendants that
2 their wage statements failed "to state the address of the legal entity that is the employer." Now that
3 33 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of this violation, and
4 Defendants have failed to cure the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff has exhausted administrative
5 requirements for bringing a claim under the PAGA with respect to this violation. Furthermore, 65
6 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of all non-curable violations
7 and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations. Plaintiff has
8 exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act
9 with respect to these violations.

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

12 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

- 15 1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
- 16 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
- 17 3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
- 18 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated
19 damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and
20 1197;
- 21 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties
22 according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 23 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof
24 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
- 25 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof
26 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
- 27 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
28 226;

1 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
2 203;

3 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for unreimbursed business expenses according to
4 proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;

5 11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for wages unlawfully deducted pursuant to Labor
6 Code §§ 212 and 1198;

7 12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the
8 Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or
9 practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
10 *seq.*;

11 13. Upon the Tenth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§
12 226 and 1198.5;

13 14. Upon the Eleventh Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other
14 Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§
15 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each
16 failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional
17 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the
18 amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent
19 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial
20 violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee
21 per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation
22 pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code section
23 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as waiting time under
24 the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each
25 subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which
26 no civil penalty is specifically provided;

27 15. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6
28 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

1 16. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§
2 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

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

4 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

6
7 DATED: October 23, 2023

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

8
9 By: 

10 Young K. Park

11 William C. Sung

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff LAN THANH LUU
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28