ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda
11/20/2023 at 05:12:18 PM
By: Damaree Franklin,
Deputy Clerk

Jonathan M. Genish (State Bar No. 259031)
jgenish@blackstonepc.com
Barbara DuVan-Clarke (State Bar No. 259268)
BDC@blackstonepc.com
Alexander K. Spellman (State Bar No. 250398)
aspellman@blackstonepc.com
P.J. Van Ert (State Bar No. 234858)
pjvanert@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 622-4278/ Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiff KENCHASA BRYANT A/K/A KENCHASA PICQUET, individually, and on behalf of Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act,

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

KENCHASA BRYANT A/K/A KENCHASA PICQUET, individually, and on behalf of Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

OOMA, INC.; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV052289

COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT ACTION UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 2698 *ET SEQ.*

COMES NOW, Plaintiff KENCHASA BRYANT A/K/A KENCHASA PICQUET ("Plaintiff"), individually, and on behalf of other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act, and alleges as follow:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is an enforcement action under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA") to recover civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and all individuals who worked for Defendants in the State of California as hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees at any time during the period from September 13, 2022 to final judgment ("Aggrieved Employees").

2. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants hired Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees but failed to properly pay them all wages owed for all time worked (including minimum wages, straight time/regular rate wages, and overtime wages), failed to provide them with all meal periods and rest periods and associated premium wages to which they were entitled, failed to timely pay them all wages due during their employment, failed to timely pay them all wages due upon termination of their employment, failed to provide them with accurate itemized wage statements, failed to maintain accurate payroll records, and failed to reimburse them for necessary business expenses.

3. As a result, Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks to recover all available remedies under PAGA, including, but not limited to, civil penalties and attorney's fees and costs.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, section 10. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

5. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are either citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally availed themselves of the California market to render the exercise of

jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Further, no federal question is at issue because the claims asserted herein are based solely on California law.

6. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Alameda. Moreover, many of the acts, events, and violations alleged herein relating to Plaintiff occurred in the State of California, County of Alameda.

THE PARTIES

7. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff KENCHASA BRYANT A/K/A KENCHASA PICQUET is and was an individual residing in Contra Costa County in the State of California.

8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant OOMA, INC. was and is, an employer who does business in California, with locations throughout the state of California, and whose employees are engaged throughout Alameda County and the State of California, including in Alameda County at 38897 Cherry Street, Newark, CA 94560.

9. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 25 but will seek leave of this Court to amend the complaint and serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

10. At all relevant times, Defendants were the employers of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes. Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of the employment of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to make Defendants liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

11. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, to set work rules and conditions governing their employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

12. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees' employment for them to be their joint employers.

13. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved

Employees.

14. Defendants continue to employ hourly paid and/or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants are in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

16. Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately September 2018 through approximately November 2022 as a sales representative. Defendants employed Plaintiff at Defendants' location at 38897 Cherry Street, Newark, CA 94560. Plaintiff performed various duties for Defendants including, among other things, conducting sales, closing calls with companies, and business to business sales. Defendants provide various communications and securities services to businesses and consumers and maintain employees throughout California, including in Alameda County.

17. Defendants hired Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees but failed to properly pay them all minimum wages, regular rate/straight time wages, or overtime wages for all hours worked, failed to provide all meal and rest breaks to which they were entitled, failed to timely pay all wages during or upon termination of employment, failed to provide accurate wage statements, failed to keep accurate employment records, failed to reimburse necessary business-related expenses, and failed to adhere to other related protections afforded by the California Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to the protections afforded by the Labor Code and the applicable Wage Order, yet as set forth in detail below, engaged in a systematic pattern and practice of violating the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Order.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

19. At all times set forth herein, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by

Defendants.

20. PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty, including unpaid wages and premium wages, to be assessed and collected by the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

21. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action may be brought by an "aggrieved employee," who is any person employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed.

22. Plaintiff and the other employees are "Aggrieved Employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) because they are current or former employees of Defendants against whom one of more of the alleged violations were committed.

23. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee, including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements have been met:

(a) The Aggrieved Employee shall give written notice by certified mail (hereinafter "Employee's Notice") to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

(b) The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter "LWDA Response") to the employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA Response, or if the LWDA Response is not provided within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

24. On September 12, 2023, Plaintiff provided notice by electronic submission to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3. **A true and correct copy of the Employee's Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A.**

25. Plaintiff did not receive a LWDA Response within sixty-five calendar days of providing the Employee's Notice.

26. Therefore, the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802 have been satisfied.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §§ 2699, *ET SEQ.*

(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)

27. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

28. Plaintiff brings this action on an individual basis and on a representative basis on behalf of other Aggrieved Employees and the State of California, in Plaintiff's capacity as a private attorney general pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*

29. PAGA expressly provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3." Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a).

30. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to

exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

31. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are "Aggrieved Employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

32. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous sections of the California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, the following:

(a) Violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 for failure to pay minimum wages, as set forth more fully below;

(b) Violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 for failure to pay overtime wages, as set forth more fully below;

(c) Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to provide legally required meal periods, as set forth more fully below;

(d) Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to pay required meal period premiums, as set forth more fully below;

(e) Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to provide legally required rest periods, as set forth more fully below;

(f) Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to pay required rest period premiums, as set forth more fully below;

(g) Violation of California Labor Code section 204 for failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during employment, as set forth more fully before;

(h) Violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 for failure to pay all wages at time of discharge from employment, as set forth more fully below;

(i) Violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) for failure to provide accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as set forth more fully below;

(j) Violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) for failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as set forth more fully below; and

(k) Violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business-related expenses, as set forth more fully below.

33. Pursuant to PAGA, and in particular Labor Code sections 2699(a), 2699.3, and 2699.5, Plaintiff, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seek assessment and collection of civil penalties for Plaintiff, all Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California against Defendants for violations of Labor Code sections set forth herein, including penalties under California Labor Code sections 2699, 558, 210, 1197.1, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, and 1197.1, penalties under the applicable IWC Wage Order, and any and all additional penalties and remedies as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

34. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by Aggrieved Employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the LWDA for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five (25%) to the Aggrieved Employees.

35. Plaintiff retained counsel to file this court action, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, 2699(g)(1), and any other applicable statute.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

36. California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage for employees fixed by the IWC is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

37. The IWC set the minimum wage for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the applicable IWC Wage Order.

38. Such "off-the-clock" work that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were suffered and/or permitted to work, and for which Plaintiff and class members did not receive minimum wage include *inter alia*:

i. suffering or permitting Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to perform work for the benefit of Defendants prior to clocking-in for their shift(s) including typical work duties such as scheduled work calls whether internal office calls or calls to Defendants' clients;

ii. suffering or permitting Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to perform work for the benefit of Defendants after clocking-out from their shift(s) including typical work duties such as scheduled work calls whether internal office calls or calls to Defendants' clients;

iii. suffering or permitting Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to perform work for the benefit of Defendants while "off-the-clock" during meal periods, including typical work duties and interruptions for work-related purposes by superiors;

iv. contacting Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees via email, text and/or phone calls outside of work hours to discuss work matters;

39. Moreover, Defendants had a policy, practice and procedure of rounding employee time such that Plaintiff and some or all class members were systematically unpaid and/or underpaid for time worked over the course of their employment.

40. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

Failure to Pay Proper Overtime Wages

41. Labor Code section 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require Defendants to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day; more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) consecutive days, at the rate of one-and-a-half times their regular rate for all such hours worked.

42. Labor Code section 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further requires Defendants to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who worked more than twelve (12) hours in a day or more than eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day, overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay for all such hours worked.

43. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees regularly worked

in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek and/or for seven (7) or more consecutive days, but Defendants routinely failed to properly account for all such overtime hours and further failed to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the correct overtime rates.

44. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a week and/or seven (7) consecutive days in a workweek. However, Defendants did not record Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees' actual hours worked and intentionally and willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to pay correct overtime wages included, *inter alia*: (a) when the combined total of the off-the-clock work discussed *supra* and the on-the-clock work exceed the number of hours that trigger the payment of overtime wages under Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and/or the applicable Wage Order; (b) when Defendants intentionally, willfully and/or negligently mischaracterized overtime as straight time/regular rate or minimum wage, or otherwise similarly mischaracterized double time as time-and-a-half, straight time/regular rate, or minimum wage; (c) when Defendants assigned more work than could reasonably be completed in a workday or workweek to Plaintiff and class members, but refused to authorize the overtime necessary for them to complete the assigned work; and (d) when Defendants failed to include all required wages and renumeration when calculating setting the overtime rate.

45. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees proper overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of California Labor Code section 510, and is therefore unlawful.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

46. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable IWC Order.

47. California Labor Code section 512(a) provides that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual

consent of both the employer and the employee.

48. California Labor Code section 512(a) further provides that an employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

49. The applicable IWC Wage Order sets forth the same requirements for meal breaks.

50. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who were scheduled to work for no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

51. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees who were scheduled to work for more than six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

52. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, who were scheduled to work for more than ten (10) hours but no longer then twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work in excess of ten (10) hours without receiving a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

53. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, 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 a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

54. Moreover, when meal breaks were provided, they were often interrupted, cut short, and/or Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duties as required by law.

55. Such conduct violates California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

Failure to Pay Compliant Meal Break Premiums

56. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides: “[i]f an employer fails to provide an employee a [meal] period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission… the

employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the [meal] period is not provided.

57. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides: "[i]f an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal period is not provided."

58. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees meal period premiums due in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 on each day when a complete, timely, and uninterrupted meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes was not provided.

59. Moreover, if and when meal break premiums were provided, Defendants failed to incorporate all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the regular rate of compensation for purposes of such premiums.

60. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Provide Rest Periods

61. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

62. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

63. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a timely ten (10) minute uninterrupted rest period during which time they were relieved of their duties per each four (4) hour period, or major fraction thereof worked.

64. Defendants' conduct therefore violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Pay Rest Break Premiums

65. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides: "[i]f an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,… the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the [rest] period is not provided.

66. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides: "[i]f an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.

67. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees required rest break premiums due when compliant rest periods were not provided.

68. Such conduct is in direct violation of California Labor Code section 226.7.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

69. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 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. It further provides 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.

70. California Labor Code section 204 provides 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.

71. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages due to them, within any time period permissible under California Labor Code section 204, including failure to pay minimum wages or regular rate/straight time wages, failure to pay overtime, meal break violations and rest break violations, and failure to provide other pay, remuneration, or monies as they became due, *e.g.*, accrued gratuities,

bonuses, commissions, etc.

72. Such conduct violates Labor Code section 204.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

73. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203, Defendants are required to timely pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged.

74. California Labor Code section 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.

75. California Labor Code section 202 mandates that if an employee quits, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

76. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, in accordance with California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, 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 therefore is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

77. At the time that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' employment with Defendants ended, Defendants knowingly and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed to them pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including, without limitation, minimum wages or regular rate/straight time wages, overtime, meal break violations and rest break premiums, and other pay, remuneration, or monies, *e.g.*, accrued gratuities, bonuses, commissions, etc.

78. Such conduct violates Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 203.

Failure to Provide Compliant Wage Statements

79. California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of its employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate

if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her 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 the employee.

80. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to state all correct rates of pay, all hours worked, all meal period premium wages earned, and all rest period premium wages earned.

81. Such conduct violates Labor Code section 226.

Failure to Keep Requisite Payroll Records

82. 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 in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than three years.

83. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

84. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

85. More specifically, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been injured by Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) because they were denied both their legal right and protected interest, in having available, accurate and complete payroll records pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d).

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses

86. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must

reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

87. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants, including, but not limited to purchase of necessary office supplies such as computer accessories (*e.g.*, keyboards and wireless mouse) and the usage of personal cell phones and related internet for work-related purposes.

88. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

89. Such conduct violates Labor Code sections 2802.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, 210, 558, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1 and all other penalties allowed by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes;

2. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to sections 210, 218.5 and 2699(g)(1) of California Labor Code; and

3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

DATED: November 20, 2023

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

By: ______________________________

Jonathan M. Genish, Esq.
Alex Spellman, Esq.
Barbara DuVan-Clarke, Esq.
P.J. Van Ert, Esq.

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF KENCHASA BRYANT, individually, and on behalf of Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act

EXHIBIT A

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Alexander K. Spellman
BDC@blackstonepc.com

September 12, 2023

<u>PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission</u>
California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)
Sacramento, CA 95814
https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html

RE: *Kenchasa Bryant v. OOMA, Inc.*

Dear Representative:

This office represents Kenchasa Bryant ("Claimant") with respect to Claimant's claims under the California Labor Code against OOMA, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers thereof) (collectively referred to herein as "Employer"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employer by certified mail.

Employer employed Claimant from approximately September 2018 through approximately November 2022 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. During her employment with Employer, Claimant was employed as a Sales Agent at 38897 Cherry Street, Newark, CA 94560.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA"). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of Claimant and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employer in the State of California during the relevant statutory period ("Aggrieved Employees"). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant's notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employer violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Claimant's employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("IWC Wage Orders"). The claims made on behalf of Claimant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employer engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and IWC Wage Orders require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and IWC Wage Orders further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice the regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time period, Employer regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. This off-the-clock work included making phone calls two hours before clocking in each day and conducting sales calls after clock-out to complete sales. Employer failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law. In addition, Employer utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages (including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages) to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employer also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees. Moreover, the uncompensated work described herein was often performed when Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees had already worked eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in week resulting in a failure to pay overtime compensation. Finally, Employer failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employer have failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys’ fees and costs.

///

2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512(a). A second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes must be provided before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512(a). When an employer fails to provide a meal or rest period, an hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation is owed to the employee. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employer failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally-compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employer to work more than five (5) hours per day, but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employer regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5^{th}) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10^{th}) hour of work. Meal periods, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted or cut short.

Employer's policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employer failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employer required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employer's policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the meal periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employer violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS AND PAY REST PERIOD PREMIUMS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes rest for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. When an employer fails to authorize and permit a rest period, an hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation is owed to the employee. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employer failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take legally-compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employer required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.,* 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employer's policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employer failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employer required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employer's policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

///

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the rest periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employer violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

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, Employer failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia,* straight time wages, minimum wages, overtime compensation, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described herein, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. The wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees also failed to include the name of the legal entity that employed Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

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 two years. During the relevant time period, Employer failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employer violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The IWC Wage Orders require employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employer. These costs include but are not limited to purchase of necessary office supplies such as computer accessories (*e.g.*, keyboards and wireless mouse) and the usage of personal cell phones and related internet for work-related purposes.

Accordingly, Employer violated the IWC Orders and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due to them within twenty-four (24) hours or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employer's practices of requiring Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employer failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employer also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. EMPLOYER'S OTHER VIOLATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE

Finally, pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc*. (2018) 25 Cal.App.5th 745 ("*Huff*"), as an Aggrieved Employee, Claimant has standing, and intends, on behalf of LWDA, to pursue civil penalties against Employer for any and all other Labor Code violations committed by Employer. In *Huff*, the California Court of Appeals held that an employee alleging a single violation of the Labor Code under PAGA may also bring PAGA claims against Employer for all other alleged Labor Code violations, even those suffered by other employees of the same employer. According to the *Huff* decision, Employee, as an "aggrieved" employee affected by at least one Labor Code violation may, and hereby does, pursue penalties on behalf of LWDA for unrelated Labor Code violations by Employer.

Employer is in direct violation of numerous California wage and hour laws including but not limited to said sections stated above. We hereby provide notice under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq*., and specifically ask for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that we may allege a cause of action under PAGA against

Employer for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employer's alleged violations within this time.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW

Alexander K. Spellman

Alexander K. Spellman, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

OOMA, Inc
Attn: Jenny Yuh
Agent for Service of Process
525 Almanor Avenue, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085