

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
LIZETTE RODRIGUEZ (SBN 335182)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN**

DALLAS KELLER, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general
public similarly situated;

Plaintiffs,

v.

BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: STK-CV-UOE-2023-0001968

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 (Unpaid Minimum Wages);
- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
- (7) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);
- (8) Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (Private Attorneys General Act of 2004);
- (9) Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT - STOCKTON

2024 JAN 31 PM 1:05

ST. JAMES DONNER, CLERK

Robert Pachaw

COMES NOW, Plaintiff DALLAS KELLER and JOEL ROJAS ("Plaintiffs"), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiffs exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court "original jurisdiction in all other causes", except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including the County of San Joaquin. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiffs took place in the State of California, County of San Joaquin. Defendants employed Plaintiffs within the State of California, County of San Joaquin.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff DALLAS KELLER is an individual residing in the State of California, County of San Joaquin. Plaintiff JOEL ROJAS is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Merced.

///

///

1 6. Defendant BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC., at all times herein mentioned, was and
2 is, upon information and belief, a California corporation headquartered in the State of
3 California, County of San Joaquin, and at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer
4 whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San
5 Joaquin.

6 7. At all relevant times, Defendant BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. was the “employer”
7 of Plaintiffs within the meaning of all applicable California laws and statutes.

8 8. At all times herein relevant, Defendant BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES
9 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers,
10 representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each
11 of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their
12 authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants,
13 employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein
14 were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement,
15 authorization, and consent of each defendant designated herein.

16 9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or
17 otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs, who sues
18 said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based on
19 that information and belief alleges, that each of the Defendants designated as a DOE is legally
20 responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused
21 the injuries and damages to Plaintiffs and the other class members as alleged in this Complaint.
22 Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and
23 capacities when the same have been ascertained.

24 10. Defendant BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter
25 collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

26 ///

27 ///

1 11. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or
2 affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of
3 Plaintiffs and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers and
4 employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

5 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

6 12. Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of all other members of the
7 general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil
8 Procedure section 382.

9 13. The proposed class is defined as follows:

10 All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendants
11 within the State of California at any time during the period from four years
12 preceding the filing of this Complaint to final judgment.

13 14. Plaintiffs reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

14 15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in
15 the litigation:

16 a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class
17 members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is
18 unknown to Plaintiffs at this time; however, the class is estimated to be
19 greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is
20 readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

21 b. Typicality: Plaintiffs' claims are typical of all other class members'
22 claims as demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately
23 protect the interests of the other class members with whom Plaintiffs
24 have a well-defined community of interest.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 c. Adequacy: Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of
2 each class member, with whom Plaintiffs have a well-defined community
3 of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs
4 have no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiffs'
5 attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing
6 class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiffs have
7 incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur,
8 costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily
9 expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of
10 each class member.

11 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the
12 fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder
13 of all class members is impractical.

14 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class
15 action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great
16 state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees
17 are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect
18 retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are
19 not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of
20 their rights.

21 16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that
22 predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common
23 questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

24 a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or
25 reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;

26 ///

27 ///

- 1 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt
2 employees within the State of California for all hours worked, missed
3 meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- 4 c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiffs and the other class members to
5 work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week
6 and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiffs
7 and the other class members;
- 8 d. Whether Defendants properly calculated the regular rate for Plaintiffs
9 and the other class members to worked overtime and earned incentive
10 pay;
- 11 e. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiffs and the other class members of
12 meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiffs and the other class
13 members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- 14 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the
15 other class members for all hours worked;
- 16 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other
17 class members within the required time upon their discharge or
18 resignation;
- 19 h. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and
20 the other class members during their employment;
- 21 i. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the
22 California Labor Code, including, inter alia, section 226;
- 23 j. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class
24 members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- 25 k. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- 26 l. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
27 California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 28

1 m. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary
2 penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and

3 n. Whether Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to
4 compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

5 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

6 17. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiffs
7 and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

8 18. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiffs as an hourly-paid non-
9 exempt employee during the relevant time period in the State of California.

10 19. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiffs and the other class
11 members; to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiffs' and other class members'
12 employment; and to supervise their daily employment activities.

13 20. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
14 Plaintiff and other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiffs
15 and the other class members.

16 21. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiffs and the other
17 class members.

18 22. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the
19 State of California.

20 23. Plaintiffs and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day,
21 and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

22 24. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
23 engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid
24 or non-exempt employees within the State of California. This scheme involved, inter alia,
25 failing to pay them for all hours worked, missed meal periods, and missed rest breaks in
26 violation of California law.

27 ///

1 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
3 certain wages for overtime compensation and that Plaintiffs and the other class members were
4 not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

5 26. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
6 failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other class members the required rest and meal periods
7 during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
8 Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

9 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
10 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
11 all timely and complete meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs'
12 and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, late or
13 interrupted, and that Plaintiffs and the other class members did not receive all timely and
14 proper meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when
15 a meal period was missed.

16 28. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
17 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and other class members were entitled to receive
18 all timely rest periods without interruption or payment of one additional hour of pay at
19 Plaintiffs and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, late
20 or interrupted, and that Plaintiffs and the other class members did not receive all rest periods
21 or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was
22 missed.

23 29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
24 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
25 at least minimum wages for compensation and that Plaintiffs and the other class members were
26 not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

27 ///

1 30. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
3 the wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum
4 wages and meal and rest period premiums, and that Plaintiffs and the other class members did
5 not, in fact, receive such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

6 31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
7 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
8 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact,
9 Plaintiffs and the other class members did not receive complete and accurate wage statements
10 from Defendants. The deficiencies included, inter alia, the failure to include the total number
11 of hours worked by Plaintiffs and the other class members.

12 32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
13 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to
14 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

15 33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
16 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records
17 for Plaintiffs and the other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did
18 not keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs and the other class members.

19 34. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
20 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiffs and the other class
21 members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
22 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely
23 represented to Plaintiffs and the other class members that they were properly denied wages,
24 all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 35. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
2 overtime wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members for all hours worked. Plaintiffs and
3 other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40)
4 hours per week without overtime compensation.

5 36. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide the
6 requisite uninterrupted and timely meal and rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class
7 members.

8 37. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
9 Plaintiffs and the other class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

10 38. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
11 Plaintiffs and the other class members the wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

12 39. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide
13 complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs and the other class members.

14 40. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to keep
15 complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs and the other class members.

16 41. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to properly
17 compensate Plaintiffs and the other class members pursuant to California law in order to
18 increase Defendants' profits.

19 42. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor
20 Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty
21 due to him [or her] under this article."

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**

3 **(Against BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

4 43. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1
5 through 42, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
6 forth herein.

7 44. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare
8 Commission ("IWC") Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without
9 compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular
10 rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly
11 basis.

12 45. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and
13 were required to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members employed by Defendants, who
14 work(ed) more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at
15 the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more
16 than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

17 46. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were
18 required to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members overtime compensation at a rate of two
19 times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

20 47. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation
21 at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours
22 in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh
23 day of work, and overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in
24 excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day
25 of work.

26 ///

27 ///

48. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

49. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiffs and the other class members.

50. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

51. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))

(Against BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

52. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 51, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

53. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiffs' and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

54. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

///

///

///

1 55. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
2 and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or
3 permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without
4 providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if
5 the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period
6 may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

7 56. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
8 and California Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require,
9 cause, or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day
10 without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty
11 (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the
12 second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only
13 if the first meal period was not waived.

14 57. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class
15 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and
16 who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to
17 work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less
18 than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

19 58. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class
20 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than twelve (12) hours,
21 and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required
22 to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less
23 than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

24 59. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class
25 members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were
26 required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period
27 of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.
28

60. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiffs and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of twelve (12) hours were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

61. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiffs and the other class members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other class members the full meal period premium for work performed during meal periods.

62. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

63. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

64. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest period is not provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)

(Against BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

65. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 64, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

66. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiffs' and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

///

1 67. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
2 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period
3 mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

4 68. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
5 provides that “[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods,
6 which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period” and that the “rest
7 period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net
8 rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof” unless the total daily work time is less
9 than three and one-half (3 ½) hours.

10 69. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants required Plaintiffs
11 and the other class members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting
12 a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

13 70. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants willfully required
14 Plaintiffs and the other class members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiffs
15 and the other class members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest
16 periods.

17 71. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
18 Plaintiffs and the other class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California
19 Labor Code section 226.7.

20 72. Defendants’ conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor
21 Code section 226.7.

22 73. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section
23 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
24 additional hour of pay at the employees’ regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday
25 that the rest period was not provided.

26 ///

27 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197)**

3 **(Against BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

4 74. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
5 through 73 and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
6 forth herein.

7 75. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections
8 1194 and 1197 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of
9 a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed, is unlawful.

10 76. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
11 minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members as required, pursuant to California
12 Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197.

13 77. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the minimum
14 wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197. Pursuant to those
15 sections, Plaintiffs and other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their
16 minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorney's fees, and liquidated
17 damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

18 78. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiffs and the other class
19 members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages
20 unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

21 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202)**

23 **(Against BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

24 79. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
25 through 78, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
26 forth herein.

27 ///

1 80. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections
2 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid
3 at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her
4 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72)
5 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours notice of his or her
6 intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of
7 quitting.

8 81. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and
9 willfully failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members who are no longer employed by
10 Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving
11 Defendants' employ.

12 82. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members who are no
13 longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours
14 of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and
15 202.

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

20 84. Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants
21 the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to the thirty (30) day maximum
22 as provided by Labor Code section 203.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

5
6
7
8

1 89. More specifically, Plaintiffs and the other class members have been injured by
2 Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because
3 they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving,
4 accurate and itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

5 90. Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants
6 the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California
7 Labor Code section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per
8 employee.

9 91. Plaintiffs and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to
10 ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

11 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)**

13 **(Against BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

14 92. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
15 through 91, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
16 forth herein.

17 93. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must
18 reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
19 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her
20 obedience to the directions of the employer.

21 94. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the
22 other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiffs and the
23 other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and
24 costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the
25 date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments
26 in civil actions in the State of California.

27 ///

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

(Against BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

95. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 94, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

96. The Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) expressly establishes that any provision of the Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for a violation of the Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

97. On September 18, 2023, Plaintiff Rojas provided written notice to the LWDA of the specific provisions of the Labor Code she contend were violated, and the theories supporting her contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by reference is a copy of the September 18, 2023, written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff Rojas believes that on or about November 22, 2023, the sixty-five (65) day notice period expired, and the LWDA did not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore, Plaintiffs exhausted the statutory time period to bring this action.

98. Plaintiff Rojas and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all non-exempt, hourly employees who were employed by Defendants in California from September 18, 2022 to the present and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

///

///

///

1 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

2 99. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their non-
3 exempt employees minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all hours
4 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, pursuant to the
5 mandate of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

6 100. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff Rojas and the
7 other aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay
8 all minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

9 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

10 101. In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512,
11 Defendants were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a 10-
12 minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof and were further
13 required to provide their non-exempt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five (5)
14 hours worked.

15 102. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Rojas and the other
16 aggrieved current and former employees with legally mandated meal periods and rest breaks
17 and failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

18 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

19 103. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees
20 within a specified time period pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code section 204.

21 104. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Rojas and the other
22 aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required time
23 period.

24 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

25 105. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees all
26 wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to Labor Code sections 201
27 to 204.
28

1 106. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants failed
2 to pay Plaintiff Rojas and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages pursuant to
3 Labor Code sections 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor
4 Code section 203.

5 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

6 107. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep accurate records
7 regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code sections 226, 1174,
8 and 1776.

9 108. As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants failed to
10 keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff Rojas and the other aggrieved current and former
11 employees. For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate
12 records regarding Plaintiff Rojas and the other aggrieved current and former employees' gross
13 wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly
14 rates and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

15 **Failure to Provide Paid Sick Days**

16 109. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to provide their employees
17 with paid sick days pursuant to Labor Code section 246.

18 110. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Rojas and other
19 aggrieved current and former employees with paid sick days pursuant to Labor Code section
20 246.

21 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

22 111. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its employees
23 for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct
24 consequences of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code
25 sections 2800 and 2802.

26 ///

27 ///

112. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff Rojas and the other aggrieved current and former employees for all business expenses incurred and owing them within the required time period.

Penalties

113. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiff Rojas, individually, and on behalf of the other current and former aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs, including but not limited to:

- a. Penalties under Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- b. Penalties under Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11040 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- c. Penalties under Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the Labor Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- d. Penalties under Labor Code section 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- e. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes; and

1 f. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 1194, and
2 2699, and any other applicable statute.

3 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*)**

5 **(Against BOBCAT CENTRAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

6 114. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
7 through 113, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully
8 set forth herein.

9 115. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be unfair,
10 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiffs, the other class members, to the general public, and
11 Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek to enforce important rights affecting
12 the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

13 116. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
14 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business &
15 Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*

16 117. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*
17 may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants'
18 policy and practice of requiring Plaintiffs and the other class members work overtime hours
19 without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and
20 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Plaintiffs and the other class
21 members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper
22 compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover,
23 Defendants' policy and practice of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the other class
24 members violate California Labor Code sections 201 and 202. Defendants also violated
25 California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1194, 1197, 2800 and 2802.

26 118. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants
27 unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

1 119. Plaintiffs and the other class members have been personally injured by
2 Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not
3 necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

4 120. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*,
5 Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and
6 retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this
7 Complaint; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section
8 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

9 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

10 Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly
11 situated, requests a trial by jury.

12 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

13 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all other members of the
14 general public similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and
15 severally, as follows:

16 **Class Certification**

- 17 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
18 2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as representatives of the Class;
19 3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel; and
20 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most
21 current contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

22 **As to the First Cause of Action**

- 23 5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
24 Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to
25 pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiffs and the other class members;

- 26 6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special
27 damages as may be appropriate;
28

1 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
2 from the date such amounts were due;

3 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
4 California Labor Code section 1194; and

5 9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

6 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

7 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
8 Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to
9 provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiffs and the other class
10 members;

11 11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiffs and the other class members of one
12 (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal
13 period was not provided;

14 12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
15 proof;

16 13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);

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

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

20 16. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

21 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

22 17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
23 Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all
24 rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class members;

25 18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiffs and the other class members of one
26 (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest
27 period was not provided;

1 19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
2 proof;

3 20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);

4 21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
5 due; and

6 22. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

7 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

8 23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
9 Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs
10 and the other class members;

11 24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be
12 appropriate;

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

15 26. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
16 California Labor Code section 1194(a);

17 27. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

18 28. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

19 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

20 29. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
21 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at
22 the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiffs and the other class members no longer
23 employed by Defendants;

24 30. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
25 proof;

26 31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for
27 the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;
28

32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

33. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

34. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiffs and the other class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

35. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

36. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g); and

38. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

39. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

40. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

41. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

42. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

44. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

///

///

///

1 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

2 45. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code
3 sections 2698, *et seq.*, the PAGA, for civil penalties pursuant to Defendants' violations of
4 Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5,
5 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802;

6 46. Upon the Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code
7 Sections 210, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute; and

8 47. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

9 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

10 48. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
11 Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiffs and the
12 other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and
13 rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages
14 to Plaintiffs and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiffs' and the other class
15 members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

16 49. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and other class members and all pre-
17 judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

18 50. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
19 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
20 Defendants as a result of violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200,
21 *et seq.*;

22 51. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
23 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

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

26 ///

27 ///

53. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

Dated: January 29, 2024

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: 

Douglas Han
Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh
Lizette Rodriguez
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT 1



September 18, 2023

BY U.S. MAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov
State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: BOBCAT CENTRAL INC.

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Joel Rojas against Bobcat Central Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer or managing agent acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 1-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "BOBCAT").

Mr. Rojas is pursuing his California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Rojas may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Bobcat Central Inc. is a California stock corporation located at 3516 Newton Road, Stockton, California 95205.

BOBCAT employed Mr. Rojas as an hourly-paid non-exempt Mechanic within one year of the date of this letter (until or until around August of 2023) in the State of California. BOBCAT directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Rojas's and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

///

¹ Mr. Rojas does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Rojas will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Rojas is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Rojas and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

LWDA

September 18, 2023

Page 2 of 7

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Rojas may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of BOBCAT within the State of California.

BOBCAT failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly compensate minimum and overtime wages, failed to properly provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks or pay premium wages in lieu thereof, failed to issue compliant wage statements, and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751, an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Rojas has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all aggrieved employees at BOBCAT, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

BOBCAT has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay time-and-a-half or double-time overtime wages and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. BOBCAT failed to compensate Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. BOBCAT also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses into Mr. Rojas's and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

///

///

LWDA

September 18, 2023

Page 3 of 7

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, BOBCAT failed to pay aggrieved employees paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, BOBCAT routinely required Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with BOBCAT's policies and expectations and service machinery. BOBCAT failed to provide coverage to Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Lastly, BOBCAT failed to authorize and permit Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, BOBCAT failed to compensate Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." BOBCAT required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." BOBCAT required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

///

///

LWDA

September 18, 2023

Page 4 of 7

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits their employment, their wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours' previous notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, BOBCAT failed to pay Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code sections 203 and 210.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, BOBCAT failed to pay Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, and is therefore liable under California Labor Code section 210.

///

///

///

LWDA

September 18, 2023

Page 5 of 7

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, BOBCAT did not provide Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from BOBCAT were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees, (4) all deductions for Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of their social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. Pursuant to the code, (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, BOBCAT failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees.

///

///

LWDA

September 18, 2023

Page 6 of 7

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, BOBCAT did not provide Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their job duties or in direct consequence of their obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Rojas and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by BOBCAT, including for purchasing equipment they were required to wear while working and using their personal cell phones for work-related purposes.

We believe that Mr. Rojas and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code sections 2698, et seq. for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in question and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor Code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Rojas will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of BOBCAT within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

LWDA

September 18, 2023

Page 7 of 7

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Han", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Legal Department
c/o Bobcat Central Inc.
3516 Newton Road
Stockton, California 95205
Agent for Service of Process for Bobcat Central Inc.

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

PROOF OF SERVICE
1013A(3) CCP

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101, Pasadena, California 91103 and my electronic service address is eedens@justicelawcorp.com.

On February 7, 2024, I served the foregoing document described as

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

for the following case: **Keller v. Bobcat Central Inc.**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA Case No.: CM-982220-23**
Court Case No.: STK-CV-UOE-2023-0001968
San Joaquin County Superior Court

on interested parties in this action by electronically submitting as follows:

State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Pursuant to California Senate Bill No. 836, I caused the documents described above to be electronically submitted by and through the procedure stated on the website of the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

[X] STATE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on February 7, 2024, at Pasadena, California.



Ethan Edens