

D.LAW, INC.
 Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
 David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
 David Keledjian (SBN 309135)
d.keledjian@d.law
 David Arakelyan (SBN 337076)
d.arakelyan@d.law
 880 E. Broadway
 Glendale, CA 91205
 Telephone: (818) 962-6465
 Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff SEAN GITTENS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

SEAN GITTENS, on behalf of himself and all
 others similarly situated, and the general
 public,

Plaintiff,

v.

NVA MASH CAPITAL PARTNERS, LP, a
 California corporation; NVA MASH
 VETERINARY MANAGEMENT, LP, a
 California corporation; NVA ABBY GP, INC.,
 a California corporation; NATIONAL
 VETERINARY ASSOCIATES, INC., a
 Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through
 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

12/15/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: R. Lozano Deputy

Case No.: 23STCV23169

Amended As a Matter of Right Pursuant to
 Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(C)

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198);
3. Failure to Pay Hourly Wages and Overtime (Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1997.1 and 1198);
4. Failure to Pay Vacation Wages (Lab. Code § 227.3);
5. Failure to Pay Proper Sick Pay (Lab. Code § 246);
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Written Wage Statements (Lab. Code §§ 226(a));
7. Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203);
8. Failure to Indemnify (Lab. Code § 2802); and
9. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*); and
10. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff SEAN GITTENS (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, the
2 State of California, and the general public, complain and allege as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action against Defendants NVA MASH
5 CAPITAL PARTNERS, LP, a California corporation; NVA MASH VETERINARY
6 MANAGEMENT, LP, a California corporation; NVA ABBY GP, INC., a California corporation;
7 NATIONAL VETERINARY ASSOCIATES, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through
8 50, inclusive, (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for alleged violations of the California Labor
9 Code and California Business and Professions Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that
10 Defendants have:

- 11 a. failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;
- 12 b. failed to pay them double time wages at the correct rate;
- 13 c. failed to pay them overtime and/or double time wages by failing to include all
14 applicable remuneration in calculating the regular rate of pay;
- 15 d. failed to provide them with meal periods;
- 16 e. failed to provide them with rest periods;
- 17 f. failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and rest periods;
- 18 g. failed to pay them proper sick time pay;
- 19 h. failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements;
- 20 i. failed to reimburse them with necessary business expenditures; and
- 21 j. failed to pay them all of their final wages following separation of employment.

22 Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class and
23 representative action to recover unpaid wages, liquidated damages, civil and statutory penalties,
24 restitution and related relief on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, and the general public.

25 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

26 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the monetary
27 damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff from Defendants conduct exceeds the minimal jurisdiction
28 of the Superior Court of the State of California.

3. Venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose this county because at least some of the transactions that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found, maintains offices, transacts business and/or has an agent therein.

4. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County because Defendants' have at all times alleged herein, conducted business in Los Angeles County, and throughout California. As such, venue is proper in any county in California.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff SEAN GITTENS is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, an individual residing in the State of California.

6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant NVA MASH CAPITAL PARTNERS, LP is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing business in the State of California.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant NVA MASH VETERINARY MANAGEMENT, LP is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing business in the State of California.

8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant NVA ABBY GP, INC. is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing business in the State of California.

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant NATIONAL VETERINARY ASSOCIATES, INC. is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a Delaware corporation doing business in the State of California.

10. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged herein and that Plaintiff's alleged damages were proximately caused by these defendants, and each of

1 them. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege both the true names and capacities of the DOE
2 defendants when ascertained.

3 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
4 mentioned herein, some or all of the defendants were the representatives, agents, employees, partners,
5 directors, associates, joint venturers, joint employers, owners, principals or co-participants of some
6 or all of the other defendants, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting within the course
7 and scope of such relationship and with the full knowledge, consent and ratification by such other
8 defendants.

9 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
10 mentioned herein, some of the defendants pursued a common course of conduct, acted in concert and
11 conspired with one another, and aided and abetted one another to accomplish the occurrences, acts
12 and omissions alleged herein.

13 13. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Code
14 of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest among the
15 persons who comprise the readily ascertainable classes defined below and because Plaintiff is
16 unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in managing this case as a class action.

17 14. **Relevant Time Period:** The relevant time period is defined as the time period
18 beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until judgment is entered.

- 19 a. **Hourly Employee Class:** All persons employed by Defendants, collectively or
20 separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in hourly or
21 non-exempt positions in California four years prior to the filing of this action and
22 ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action (“Hourly Employee
23 Class”).
- 24 b. **Meal Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked in
25 a shift in excess of five hours during the four years prior to the filing of this action
26 and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 27 c. **Rest Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked a
28 shift of at least three and one-half (3.5) hours the four years prior to the filing of
this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- d. **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
separated from their employment with Defendants during the period beginning
three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is
entered.

///

- 1 e. **Vacation Pay Class**: All persons employed by Defendants in California who
2 earned paid vacation days, including but not limited to, "Floating Holidays,"
3 without receiving compensation for each vested paid vacation day during the
4 **Relevant Time Period**.
- 5 f. **Sick-Pay Class**: All persons employed by Defendants in California who, at any
6 time from four years prior to the filing of this action and ending on the date that
7 final judgment is entered in this action, worked for more than 30 days for
8 Defendants, and were not paid for at least one hour of sick time for every 30 hours
9 of work thereafter, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12-month period of
10 employment.
- 11 g. **Wage Statement Class**: All persons employed by Defendants in California during
12 the period beginning one year before the filing of this action and ending when final
13 judgment is entered.
- 14 h. **Expense Reimbursement Class**: All persons employed by Defendants in
15 California who incurred business expenses during the **Relevant Time Period**.
- 16 i. **UCL Class**: All **Hourly Employee Class** and **Expense Reimbursement Class**
17 members employed by Defendants in California during the four years prior to the
18 filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
19 action.

20 15. **Reservation of Rights**: Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the right
21 to amend or modify the class definitions with greater specificity, by further division into sub-classes
22 and/or by limitation to particular issues.

23 16. **Numerosity**: The class members are so numerous that the individual joinder of each
24 individual class member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact number of
25 class members, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that the actual number
26 exceeds the minimum required for numerosity under California law.

27 17. **Commonality and Predominance**: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all
28 class members and predominate over any questions which affect only individual class members.
These common questions include, but are not limited to:

- 23 a. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
24 employees with their rest periods;
- 25 b. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
26 employees with their meal periods;
- 27 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members when they
28 have not been provided with meal and rest periods at the appropriate rates of pay;

- d. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class members for all time worked;
- e. Whether Defendants failed to pay proper vacation pay;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to pay proper sick time pay;
- g. Whether Defendants failed to provide class members with accurate written wage statements as a result of providing them with written wage statements with inaccurate entries for, among other things, amounts of gross and net wages, and total hours worked;
- h. Whether Defendants applied policies or practices that result in late and/or incomplete final wage payments;
- i. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse class members for all necessary business expenses incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- j. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under Labor Code section 203; and
- k. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition;

18. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other class members' claims. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendants have a policy or practice of failing to comply with the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code as alleged in this Complaint.

19. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative in that he has no interests that are adverse to, or otherwise conflict with, the interests of absent class members and is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on their behalf. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the other class members.

20. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent class members, are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of Plaintiff and absent class members.

21. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and efficient adjudication of the class members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to simultaneously and efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the monetary amounts due to many individual class members are likely to be relatively small and would thus make it difficult, if not impossible, for individual class members to both seek and obtain relief. Moreover, a class action will serve an important public interest by permitting class members to effectively pursue the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will prevent the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

22. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a non-exempt employee during the relevant and statutory periods.

23. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff and Class members proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.

24. Plaintiff and Class Members were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Defendants implemented a clock in system, where Plaintiff and Class Members were required to first sign in at the start of their work shift and then to clock in using a computer system. There was generally a wait time between the two procedures, for which no wages were paid. Furthermore, Defendants had a common policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods, which were systemically denied.

25. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Plaintiff and Class Members to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

26. The regular rate of pay under California law includes all remuneration for employment paid, on behalf of the employer, to the employee. This requirement includes but is not limited to commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, shift differential pay, etc. During the applicable limitations

1 period, Defendants violated the rights of Plaintiff and Class Members by failing to pay them overtime
2 wages, sick pay wages, and premium pay wages by not correctly calculating their regular rate of pay
3 to include all applicable remuneration, including shift differential pay as well performance-based non-
4 discretionary bonuses.

5 27. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
6 Class Members the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law.
7 Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Plaintiff and Class Members were denied the
8 opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work.
9 Additionally, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid
10 meal periods. Furthermore, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and
11 Class Members with second meal periods when they worked shifts of ten or more.

12 28. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30)
13 minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal
14 period as part of each work shift and (2) Defendants' practice of requiring putative class members to
15 continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

16 29. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
17 Class Members the opportunity to take rest periods in compliance with the California Law. Plaintiff
18 and Class Members were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4)
19 hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest
20 period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2)
21 no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods,
22 or that properly advised Plaintiff and Class Members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy
23 and practice of requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to remain on the premises during their paid rest
24 breaks; (4) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue working
25 through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload.

26 30. Additionally, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to clock in and out
27 when leaving hospital premises during the rest periods, thus being denied paid rest breaks to which
28 they were entitled.

1 31. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members premium pay
2 wages at their appropriate and correct regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

3 32. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with accurate wage statements as
4 mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage
5 statements as “a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee’s wages, or
6 separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing.”
7 Additionally, the wage statements issued to Plaintiff and Class Members were not recorded in “ink
8 or other indelible form.”

9 33. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as “gross wages
10 earned” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

11 34. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as “total hours worked
12 by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were
13 not included.

14 35. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as “net wages earned”
15 were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

16 36. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(8) as “the name and
17 address of the legal entity that is the employer” was not properly reflected on the wage statements.

18 37. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as “all applicable
19 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
20 hourly rate by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including
21 overtime, and the proper overtime rates of pay, were not included.

22 38. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with paper pay
23 stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters.
24 Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ wage statement were only provided in electronic format in violation
25 of Labor Code § 226.

26 39. Plaintiff and Class Members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in
27 executing their duties under Defendant’s employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were
28 required to use their personal cellular phones and personal vehicles, all necessary to perform their

1 duties under Defendants' employ. Additionally, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to clean
2 and maintain their uniforms, which were required to be worn. Plaintiff and Class members were not
3 reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses.

4 40. Defendants also had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay
5 Plaintiff and Class Members the requisite and accrued vacation time pay in accordance with
6 California Law. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay all accrued vacation time owed to Plaintiff and
7 Class Members upon their separation from employment.

8 41. Finally, Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay
9 Plaintiff and Class Members the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law.
10 Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not
11 paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every
12 12 month period of work. Additionally, any sick time payments made were not paid at the applicable
13 regular rate of pay, as required by law.

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

16 **(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1174, and 1198)**

17 **(Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class)**

18 42. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if
19 fully alleged herein.

20 43. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members have been
21 non-exempt employees of Defendant entitled to the full meal period protections of both the Labor
22 Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

23 44. Labor Code section 512 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare
24 Commission Wage Order impose an affirmative obligation on employers to provide non-exempt
25 employees with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period
26 of five hours, and to provide them with two uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty
27 minutes for each work period of ten hours.

28 45. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare

Commission Wage Order (“Wage Order”) both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work during required meal periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of premium wages on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required meal period.

46. Compensation for missed meal periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor Code section 200.

47. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

48. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:

No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an ‘on duty’ meal period and counted as time worked. An ‘on duty’ meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time.

49. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was not subject to a valid on-duty meal period agreement. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not subject to valid on-duty meal period agreements with Defendants.

50. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period, as required by Labor Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order. Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work. Additionally, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods. Furthermore, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members with second meal periods when they worked shifts of ten or more hours.

///

1 51. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
2 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to pay premium wages to **Meal Period Sub-**
3 **Class** members when they worked five (5) hours without clocking out for any meal period.

4 52. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
5 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
6 **Sub-Class** with a second meal period when they worked shifts of ten or more hours and failed to pay
7 them premium wages as required by Labor Code 512 and the applicable Wage Order.

8 53. Moreover, Defendants written policies fail to inform Meal period Class Members of
9 their meal period rights under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

10 54. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-**
11 **Class** members additional premium wages, and/or were not paid premium wages at the employees'
12 regular rates of pay when required meal periods were not provided.

13 55. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6, 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff, on behalf of
14 himself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seek to recover unpaid premium wages, interest
15 thereon, and costs of suit.

16 56. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
17 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the
18 **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seek to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS**

21 **(Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198)**

22 **(Plaintiff and Rest Period Sub-Class)**

23 57. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
24 herein.

25 58. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class** members have been
26 non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full rest period protections of both the Labor
27 Code and the applicable Wage Order.

28 59. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order imposes an affirmative obligation on

1 employers to permit and authorize employees to take required rest periods at a rate of no less than ten
2 minutes of net rest time for each four hour work period, or major fraction thereof, that must be in the
3 middle of each work period insofar as practicable.

4 60. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order both prohibit
5 employers from requiring employees to work during required rest periods and require employers to
6 pay non-exempt employees an hour of premium wages at the employees' regular rates of pay, on each
7 workday that the employee is not provided with the required rest period(s).

8 61. Compensation for missed rest periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor
9 Code section 200.

10 62. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that
11 violate the Wage Order.

12 63. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
13 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing members of the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
14 with net rest period of at least ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hour work period, or major
15 fraction thereof, as required by the applicable Wage Order.

16 64. Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with rest periods of
17 at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1)
18 Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second
19 rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that
20 encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised **Rest Period Sub-Class**
21 members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring **Rest Period**
22 **Sub-Class** members to remain on the premises during their rest breaks; (4) Defendants' policy and
23 practice of requiring **Rest Period Sub-Class** members to continue working through their rest breaks
24 due to the excessive workload.

25 65. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
26 members additional premium wages when required rest periods were not provided.

27 66. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself
28 and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seek to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and

1 costs of suit.

2 67. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
3 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Rest**
4 **Period Sub-Class** members, seek to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

5 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FAILURE TO PAY HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES**

7 **(Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1197 and 1198)**

8 **(Plaintiff and Hourly Employee Class)**

9 68. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
10 herein.

11 69. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members are or have been
12 non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full protections of the Labor Code and the
13 applicable Wage Order.

14 70. Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during
15 which an employee is subject to the control of the employer, and includes all the time the employee
16 is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so."

17 71. Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt
18 employees at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consist of all hours
19 that an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

20 72. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
21 employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under the applicable Wage
22 Order.

23 73. Labor Code section 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover liquidated
24 damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon in addition
25 to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon.

26 74. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less
27 than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a
28 payroll period.

1 75. Labor Code section 1197.1 provides that it is unlawful for any employer or any other
2 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent or employee of another person, to pay an
3 employee, or cause an employee to be paid, less than the applicable minimum wage.

4 76. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ employees under
5 conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

6 77. Labor Code section 204 requires employers to pay non-exempt employees their earned
7 wages for the normal work period at least twice during each calendar month on days the employer
8 designates in advance and to pay non-exempt employees their earned wages for labor performed in
9 excess of the normal work period by no later than the next regular payday.

10 78. Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for employers to pay their employees lower
11 wages than required by contract or statute while purporting to pay them legal wages.

12 79. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order require employees
13 to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than one and one-half times their respective
14 regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in one workday, all hours worked in
15 excess of forty hours in one workweek, and/or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh
16 consecutive day of one workweek.

17 80. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order also require
18 employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than two times their respective
19 regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve hours in one workday and for all hours
20 worked in excess of eight hours on a seventh consecutive workday during the workweek.

21 81. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, Defendants have applied
22 centrally devised policies and practices to her and **Hourly Employee Class** members with respect to
23 working conditions and compensation arrangements.

24 82. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay hourly wages to Plaintiff and **Hourly**
25 **Employee Class** members for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime hours at
26 statutory and/or agreed rates.

27 83. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were not paid proper wages and
28 overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**

1 members were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid
2 wages. Specifically, Defendants implemented a clock in system, where Plaintiff and **Hourly**
3 **Employee Class** members were required to first sign in at the start of their work shift and then to
4 clock in using a computer system. There was generally a wait time between the two procedures, for
5 which no wages were paid. Furthermore, Defendants had a common policy and practice of requiring
6 Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal
7 periods, which were systemically denied.

8 84. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to
9 work in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week,
10 entitling Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to minimum and overtime wages, which
11 they were systemically denied.

12 85. The regular rate of pay under California law includes all remuneration for employment
13 paid, on behalf of the employer, to the employee. This requirement includes but is not limited to
14 commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, shift differential pay, etc. During the applicable limitations
15 period, Defendants violated the rights of Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members by failing
16 to pay them overtime wages, sick pay wages, and premium pay wages by not correctly calculating
17 their regular rate of pay to include all applicable remuneration, including shift differential pay as well
18 as performance-based non-discretionary bonuses.

19 86. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
20 members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid the
21 full amount of wages earned during each pay period during the applicable limitations period,
22 including overtime wages.

23 87. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 218.6, 223, 510, 1194 and 1194.2, Plaintiff, on
24 behalf of himself and **Hourly Employee Class** members, seek to recover unpaid straight time and
25 overtime wages, interest thereon and costs of suit.

26 88. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
27 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and
28 **Hourly Employee Class** members, seek to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY VACATION WAGES
(Lab. Code § 227.3)
(Plaintiff and Vacation Pay Class)

89. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

90. California Labor Code section 227.3 provides:

Unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated representative, in the resolution of any dispute with regard to vested vacation time, shall apply the principles of equity and fairness.

91. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and members of the **Vacation Pay Class** accrued vacation time during their employment with Defendants.

92. However, Defendants' implemented a common policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and **Vacation Pay Class** members for all accrued vacation wages upon separation of employment, in violation of Labor Code 227.3.

93. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the members of the **Vacation Pay Class** are entitled to restitution for all unpaid amounts due and owing to within four years (4) of the date of the filing of the original Complaint until the date of entry of judgment.

94. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the members of the **Vacation Pay Class**, seeks interest thereon pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6, costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

///

///

///

///

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY PROPER SICK PAY
(Lab. Code § 246)
(Plaintiff and Sick Pay Class)

95. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

96. Labor Code Section 246 affords an employee “who works in California for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment [] paid sick days . . . of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked” and “no less than 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month period.”

97. Additionally, Subsection (l) of Section 246 provides:

For the purposes of this section, an employer shall calculate paid sick leave using any of the following calculations:

(1) Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek.

98. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff and **Sick Pay Class** Members the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law, at the employees’ applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, the sick pay paid to Plaintiff and **Sick Pay Class** Members did not account for the shift differential pay as well as performance-based non-discretionary bonuses, which were never factored into the rate upon which sick pay was accrued and paid.

99. Therefore, **Sick Pay Class** Members are owed the unpaid balance of said wages pursuant to the Wage order according to proof at trial, interest pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.6 and 1194(a), Civil Code §§ 3287 and § 3289, and reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a).

///

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS**

3 **(Lab. Code § 226)**

4 **(Plaintiff and Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class)**

5 100. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
6 herein.

7 101. Labor Code section 226(a) states:

8 An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages,
9 shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the
10 check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if
11 wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized
12 statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
13 worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (3) the
14 number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the
15 employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that
16 all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
17 aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the
18 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
19 name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
20 security number or an employee identification number other than a
21 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that
22 is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as
23 defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the
24 legal entity that secured the services of the employer, and (9) all
25 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
26 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
27 employee and, beginning July 1, 2013, if the employer is a temporary
28 services employer as defined in Section 201.3, the rate of pay and the
total hours worked for each temporary services assignment. The
deductions made from payment of wages shall be recorded in ink or
other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year,
and a copy of the statement and the record of the deductions shall be
kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of
employment or at a central location within the State of California. For
purposes of this subdivision, 'copy' includes a duplicate of the itemized
statement provided to an employee or a computer-generated record that
accurately shows all of the information required by this subdivision.

102. The Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("DLSE") has sought to harmonize the
"detachable part of the check" provision and the "accurate itemized statement in writing" provision
of Labor Code section 226(a) by allowing for electronic wage statements so long as each employee
retains the right to elect to receive a written paper stub or record and that those who are provided with
electronic wage statements retain the ability to easily access the information and convert the electronic

1 statements into hard copies at no expense to the employee. (DLSE Opinion Letter July 6, 2006).

2 103. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
3 limitations period, Defendants have failed to provide **Wage Statement Class** members with written
4 wage statements as described above. Additionally, the wage statements issued to class members
5 failed to: account for the unpaid minimum wages, overtime, and premium pay wages described; and
6 state the proper and correct regular rates of pay for overtime and sick pay wages paid.

7 104. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class**
8 Members with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE
9 Opinion Letters. Plaintiff's and **Wage Statement Class** members' wage statement were only
10 provided in electronic format in violation of Labor Code § 226.

11 105. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failure to provide her and **Wage**
12 **Statement Class** members with accurate written wage statements were intentional in that Defendants
13 have the ability to provide them with accurate wage statements but have intentionally provided them
14 with written wage statements that Defendants have known do not comply with Labor Code section
15 226(a).

16 106. Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members have suffered injuries, in that
17 Defendants have violated their legal rights to receive accurate wage statements and have misled them
18 about their actual rates of pay and wages earned. In addition, inaccurate information on their wage
19 statements have prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required
20 discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed, has caused
21 difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records, and/or has led to the
22 submission of inaccurate information about wages and deductions to federal and state government
23 agencies.

24 107. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226(e), Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Wage**
25 **Statement Class** members, seek the greater of actual damages or \$50.00 for the initial pay period in
26 which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, and \$100.00 for each subsequent pay period
27 in which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of
28 \$4000.00 per class member, as well as awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL FINAL WAGES**

3 **(Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**

4 **(Plaintiff and Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class)**

5 108. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
6 herein.

7 109. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members have
8 been entitled, upon the end of their employment with Defendants, to timely payment of all wages
9 earned and unpaid before termination or resignation.

10 110. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 201, employees who have been
11 discharged have been entitled to payment of all final wages immediately upon termination.

12 111. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 202, employees who have
13 resigned after giving at least seventy-two (72) hours notice of resignation have been entitled to
14 payment of all final wages at the time of resignation.

15 112. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant time during the applicable
16 limitations period, Defendants have failed to timely pay **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class**
17 members all of their final wages in accordance with the Labor Code.

18 113. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
19 limitations period, Defendants have maintained a policy or practice of paying **Waiting Time**
20 **Penalties Sub-Class** members their final wages without regard to the requirements of Labor Code
21 sections 201 or 202 by failing to timely pay them all final wages.

22 114. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendants' failure to
23 timely pay all final wages to her and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members have been willful
24 in that Defendants have the ability to pay final wages in accordance with Labor Code sections 201
25 and/or 202 but have intentionally adopted policies or practices that are incompatible with those
26 requirements.

27 115. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 203 and 218.6, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and
28 **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members, seek waiting time penalties from the dates that their

1 final wages have first become due until paid, up to a maximum of thirty days, and interest thereon.

2 116. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
3 and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-**
4 **Class** members, seek awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

5 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY**

7 **(Lab. Code § 2802)**

8 **(Plaintiff and Reimbursement Class)**

9 117. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
10 herein.

11 118. Labor Code section 2802(a) states:

12 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary
13 expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence
14 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the
15 directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee,
16 at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful.

17 119. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not reimbursed for
18 business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff
19 and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were required to use their personal cellular phones
20 and personal vehicles, all necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ. Additionally,
21 Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were required to clean and maintain their
22 uniforms, which were required to be worn.

23 120. Accordingly, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members are entitled to
24 restitution for all unpaid amounts due and owing to within four years of the date of the filing of the
25 Complaint and until the date of entry of judgment.

26 121. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members, seeks
27 interest thereon and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees
28 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

///

///

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

3 **(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*)**

4 **(Plaintiff and UCL Class)**

5 122. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
6 herein.

7 123. Business and Professions Code section 17200 defines “unfair competition” to include
8 any unlawful business practice.

9 124. Business and Professions Code section 17203-17204 allow a person who has lost
10 money or property as a result of unfair competition to bring a class action in accordance with Code
11 of Civil Procedure section 382 to recover money or property that may have been acquired from
12 similarly situated persons by means of unfair competition.

13 125. California law requires employers to pay hourly, non-exempt employees for all hours
14 they are permitted or suffered to work, including hours that the employer knows or reasonable should
15 know that employees have worked.

16 126. Plaintiff and the **UCL Class** members re-alleges and incorporates the FIRST,
17 SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH, FIFTH, and EIGHTH causes of action herein.

18 127. Plaintiff lost money or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair competition.

19 128. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair competition.

20 129. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that by committing the Labor
21 Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 215, 216, 225,
22 226.6, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 354, 408, 512, 510, 553, 1175, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
23 1199, and 2802 as well as applicable Wage Orders, which make it a misdemeanor to commit the
24 violations alleged herein.

25 130. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and practices of,
26 *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an employer to: provide non-exempt
27 employees with compliant meal and rest periods; pay for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay;
28 proper sick time pay; reporting time pay; and reimbursement for necessary business expenditures.

1 131. Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged in this Complaint amounts to and constitutes
2 unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*
3 Business and Professions Code sections 17200 *et seq.* protects against unfair competition and allows
4 a person who has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property as a result of an unfair,
5 unlawful or fraudulent business practice to seek restitution on his own behalf and on behalf of
6 similarly situated persons in a class action proceeding.

7 132. As a result of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code during the applicable
8 limitations period, Plaintiff has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property in the form
9 of earned wages. Specifically, Plaintiff has lost money or property as a result of Defendants' conduct.

10 133. Plaintiff is informed and believes that other similarly situated persons have been
11 subject to the same unlawful policies or practices of Defendants.

12 134. Due to the unfair and unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code,
13 Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in
14 the State of California that comply with their legal obligations.

15 135. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") permits civil recovery and injunctive
16 for "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice," including if a practice or act violates
17 or is considered unlawful under any other state or federal law.

18 136. Accordingly, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 17203,
19 Plaintiffs request the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
20 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
21 Code and applicable Wage Orders.

22 137. Accordingly, pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200 and 17203, Plaintiff
23 requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
24 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
25 Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders; and upon a final hearing seek an
26 order permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and
27 employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
28 Wage Orders.

138. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **UCL Class** members, seek declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful and unfair business practices.

139. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

140. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **UCL Class** members, seek declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful and unfair business practices.

141. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

142. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

143. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802.¹

144. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not, be brought or

¹ Plaintiff hereby reserves the right to seek penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for Defendants' violations of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code, suffered by Aggrieved Employees, but not directly suffered by Plaintiff under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.

1 maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

2 145. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the
3 alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee
4 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt
5 hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of
6 Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing
7 through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as
8 “Aggrieved Employees”)

9 146. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code §
10 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”)
11 and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an intent to
12 investigate.

13 147. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil
14 penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226.7, 226(a), 227.3,
15 246, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802:

- 16 i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 227.3, 246 1174, 1194,
17 1198 and 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee per pay period
18 for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee per
19 pay period for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code §
20 2699(f)(2));
- 21 ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty
22 (30) days’ pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);
- 23 iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
24 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
25 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully
26 withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful
27 or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-
28 five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee,

- 1 for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation
2 was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);
- 3 iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
4 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
5 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of
6 the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation
7 that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
8 employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld
9 from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the
10 subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor
11 Code § 225.5);
- 12 v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial
13 citation, two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each
14 violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before
15 the filing of this action, one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each employee for
16 each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);
- 17 vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
18 employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid,
19 and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each subsequent pay
20 period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code §
21 558);
- 22 vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
23 aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was
24 intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved
25 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197,
26 regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by
27 Labor Code § 1197.1);
- 28 viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable

attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. An order that the action be certified as a class action;
- b. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;
- c. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;
- d. Unpaid wages and overtime;
- e. Actual damages;
- f. Liquidated damages;
- g. Unreimbursed expenses;
- h. Restitution;
- i. Declaratory relief;
- j. Pre-judgment interest;
- k. Statutory penalties;
- l. Civil penalties;
- m. Costs of suit;
- n. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- o. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: December 15, 2023

D.LAW, INC.



Emil Davtyan
David Yerejian
David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
SEAN GITTENS, and the putative class

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all other similarly situated, and the general public, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: December 15, 2023

D.LAW, INC.



Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
SEAN GITTENS, and the putative class

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

I am employed in the aforesaid county, State of California; I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 880 E Broadway, Glendale, CA 91205.

Alex Medina
Doug Leach
Samantha Shapiro
Andrew Sayre
MEDINA MCKELVEY LLP
925 Highland Pointe Drive, Suite 300
Roseville, CA 95678
Phone: (916) 960-2211
Fax: (916) 742-5488
Email: alex@medinamckelvey.com
Email: doug@medinamckelvey.com
Email: samantha@medinamckelvey.com
Email: andrew@medinamckelvey.com

[] **(BY MAIL)** I placed such envelope with postage thereon fully paid in the United States mail at Glendale, California. I am “readily familiar” with this firm’s practice of collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with U.S. Postal Service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ **(BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY)** I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the address above. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

[X] (BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION) by use of email by scanning the documents and any and all documents and emailing them to email addresses above.

[X] (STATE) I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 15, 2023, at Glendale, California.

Jordan Floyd