

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
HALINA E. SZYMANSKI (SBN 341183)
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 LOS ANGELES**

RAUL SARINANA, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

v.

M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a
MAT EXPRESS, a California corporation;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 22STCV30465

**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) Collection of Due and Unpaid Wages per California Labor Code § 229;
- (9) Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (Private Attorneys General Act of 2004);
- (10) Violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

11/27/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: D. Tamayo Deputy

COMES NOW, Plaintiff RAUL SARINANA and RODOLFO SANCHEZ (“Plaintiffs,” Plaintiff Sarinana,” and “Plaintiff Sanchez”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and allege as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the 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 Los Angeles. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiffs took place in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. Defendants employed Plaintiffs within the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Sarinana is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. Plaintiff Sanchez is an individual residing in the State of California, County of San Diego.

///

///

///

1 6. Defendant M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS, at all times
2 herein mentioned, is and was, upon information and belief, a California corporation, and at all
3 times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the
4 State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

5 7. At all relevant times, Defendant M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT
6 EXPRESS was the “employer” of Plaintiffs within the meaning of all applicable laws and
7 statutes.

8 8. At all times herein relevant, Defendants M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a
9 MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint
10 venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-
11 conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within
12 the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint
13 employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and
14 all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge,
15 permission, encouragement, 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 sue
18 said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based on that
19 information and belief allege, 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. Defendants M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES
25 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

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

13. The proposed class is defined as follows:

All individuals who worked for Defendants as non-exempt employees in California at any time between September 19, 2018 and November 30, 2023 or the date of preliminary approval, whichever date is earlier, excluding former non-exempt employees who previously entered into settlement or severance agreements with Defendants.

14. Plaintiffs reserve the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

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

a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time. However, the class is estimated to be greater than two hundred fifty (250) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

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

/ / /

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

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

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

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

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

24 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt
25 employees within the State of California for all hours worked and missed
26 meal periods and rest breaks in violation of the law;

27 ///

28 ///

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

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

///

1 26. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
2 failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other class members the required rest and meal periods
3 during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
4 Orders and are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

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

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

19 29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
20 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
21 at least minimum wages for compensation and that Plaintiffs and the other class members were
22 not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

23 30. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
24 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
25 the wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime wages and
26 minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, and that Plaintiffs and the other class
27 members did not receive such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

28 ///

1 31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
3 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with the law and that Plaintiffs and the
4 other class members did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants.
5 The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by
6 Plaintiffs and the other class members.

7 32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
8 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to
9 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses and that Plaintiffs and the other class
10 members were not reimbursed for necessary business-related expenses.

11 33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
12 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records
13 for Plaintiffs and the other class members in accordance with the law and did not keep
14 complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs and the other class members.

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

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

25 36. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to properly
26 calculate and pay sick leave to Plaintiffs and the other class members.

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

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

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

41. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses.

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

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

44. Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to “sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this article.”

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through 100)

45. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 44, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

/ / /

///

1 46. Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
2 (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them
3 at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay,
4 depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

5 47. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides Defendants are and were required to
6 pay Plaintiffs and the other class members employed by Defendants, who work(ed) more than
7 eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-
8 one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours
9 in a workweek.

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

13 49. Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-
14 one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or
15 forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work,
16 and overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of
17 twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

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

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

23 52. Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the unpaid
24 balance of overtime compensation, as required by the laws, violates the provisions of Labor
25 Code sections 510 and 1198 and is unlawful.

26 53. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiffs and the other class members are
27 entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys’
28 fees.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through 100)

54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 53, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

56. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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 IWC Wage Orders.

57. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work 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 no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

58. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (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.

///

///

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 65. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code
27 sections 226.7 and 512(a).

28 ///

66. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and 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 employees' regular rates 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 M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through 100)

67. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 66, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

69. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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 IWC Wage Order.

70. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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 (3 ½) hours.

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

///

///

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

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

74. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code section 226.7.

75. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and 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 employees' regular rates of compensation for each workday that the rest period was not provided.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through 100)

76. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 75, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

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

/ / /

///

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

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through 100)

81. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 80, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

82. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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.

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

/ / /

/ / /

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

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

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

11 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))**

13 **(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through**
14 **100)**

15 87. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
16 through 86, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
17 forth herein.

18 88. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Labor Code section 226(a)
19 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized
20 statement in writing showing: (a) gross wages earned; (b) total hours worked by the employee;
21 (c) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid
22 on a piece-rate basis; (d) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of
23 the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item; (e) net wages earned; (f) the inclusive
24 dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (g) the name of the employee and his or her
25 Social Security number; (h) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
26 (i) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
27 hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payments of
28 wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day,

1 and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the
2 employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the
3 State of California.

4 89. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the
5 other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include,
6 but are not limited to, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiffs and
7 the other class members.

8 90. As a result of Defendants' violation of Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiffs and
9 the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

10 91. Plaintiffs and the other class members have been injured by Defendants'
11 intentional and willful violation of Labor Code section 226(a) because they were denied both
12 their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and itemized wage
13 statements pursuant to Labor Code section 226(a).

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

17 93. Plaintiffs and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to
18 ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to Labor Code section 226(g).

19 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

21 **(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through**
22 **100)**

23 94. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
24 through 93, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
25 forth herein.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

95. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 provide that an employer must reimburse its employee 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.

96. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

97. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Collection of Due and Unpaid Wages per Labor Code § 229)

(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through 100)

98. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 97, and each and every part thereof, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wage

99. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed, is unlawful.

100. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members as required, pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

101. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the minimum wage as required violates Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections, Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

Failure to Pay Overtime

102. Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

103. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members employed by Defendants, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

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

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

106. 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.

///

///

107. 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 as required by the law.

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

109. Pursuant to 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.

Failure to Pay Meal Premiums

110. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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 IWC Wage Order.

111. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work 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 no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

112. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (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.

/ / /

///

/ / /

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 119. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code
27 sections 226.7 and 512(a).

28 ///

120. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and 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 period was not provided.

Failure to Pay Rest Premiums

121. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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 IWC Wage Order.

122. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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 (3 ½) hours.

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

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

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

126. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code section 226.7.

/ / /

///

/ / /

127. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and 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 rest period was not provided.

128. Plaintiffs and the other class members seek these due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code section 229, which includes minimum wage, overtime wages and premium wages.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through 100)

129. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 128, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

130. 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 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“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.

131. On September 11, 2023 Plaintiff Sanchez provided written notice to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code he contends were violated and the theories supporting his contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by reference is a copy of the September 11, 2023 written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff Sanchez believes that on or about November 15, 2023, the sixty-five (65) day notice period expired, and the LWDA did not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Thus, Plaintiff Sanchez exhausted the statutory time period to bring this action.

/ / /

/ / /

1 132. Plaintiff Sanchez and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are
2 “aggrieved employees” as defined by Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are of all
3 individuals who worked for Defendants as non-exempt employees in California at any time
4 between September 19, 2021 and November 30, 2023 or the date of preliminary approval,
5 whichever date is earlier, excluding former non-exempt employees who previously entered into
6 settlement or severance agreements with Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations
7 was committed against them.

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

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

13 134. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff Sanchez and
14 the other aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to
15 pay all minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

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

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

22 136. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Sanchez and the
23 other aggrieved current and former employees with legally mandated meal periods and rest
24 breaks and failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

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

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

28 ///

1 138. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Sanchez and the
2 other aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the
3 required time period.

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

5 139. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees all
6 wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to Labor Code sections 201
7 to 204.

8 140. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants
9 failed to pay Plaintiff Sanchez and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages
10 pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties
11 pursuant to Labor Code section 203.

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

13 141. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep accurate records
14 regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code sections 226,
15 1174, and 1776.

16 142. As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants failed to
17 keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff Sanchez and the other aggrieved current and former
18 employees. For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate
19 records regarding Plaintiff Sanchez and the other aggrieved current and former employees'
20 gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, and all applicable
21 hourly rates and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

22 **Failure to Provide and Properly Pay Paid Sick Days**

23 143. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to provide their
24 employees with paid sick days at their regular rate of pay pursuant to Labor Code section 246
25 *at seq.*

26 144. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Sanchez and
27 other aggrieved current and former employees with paid sick days at the proper rate of pay
28 pursuant to Labor Code section 246 *et seq.*

1 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

2 145. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its
3 employees for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct
4 consequences of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code
5 sections 2800 and 2802.

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

9 **Penalties**

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

- 14 a. Penalties under Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a hundred
15 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
16 violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee
17 per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 18 b. Penalties under Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11040 in the amount
19 of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the
20 initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved
21 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 22 c. Penalties under Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely
23 independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the Labor
24 Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved
25 employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars
26 (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
27 violation;

28 ///

- 1 d. Penalties under Labor Code section 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred
2 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
3 violation, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved
4 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 5 e. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or
6 other statutes; and
- 7 f. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 1194,
8 and 2699, and any other applicable statute.

9 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

11 **(Against M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. d/b/a MAT EXPRESS and DOES 1 through**
12 **100)**

13 148. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
14 through 147, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
15 forth herein.

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

20 150. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of the law, and constitute
21 unlawful business acts and practices in violation of Business & Professions Code section
22 17200, *et seq.*

23 151. A violation of Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* may be
24 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. Defendants' policy and practice of
25 requiring Plaintiffs and the other class members to work overtime hours without paying them
26 proper compensation violates Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants'
27 policy and practice of requiring Plaintiffs and the other class members to work through their
28 meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violates Labor Code sections

226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policy and practice of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members violates Labor Code sections 201 and 202. Defendants also violated Labor Code sections 226(a), 1194, 1197, 2800, and 2802.

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

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

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

Class Certification

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

///

///

- 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

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

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

/ / /

As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

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

///

///

///

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

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

6 30. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
7 proof;

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

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

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

13 **As to the Sixth Cause of Action**

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

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

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

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

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

24 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 45. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor
9 Code sections 226.7, 510, 1194, and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully
10 failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiffs and the other class members;

11 46. For general unpaid wages at minimum wage rates or overtime wage rates, and
12 such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

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

14 48. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
15 from the date such amounts were due;

16 49. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
17 Labor Code sections 218.5 and 1194; and

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

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

20 51. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor
21 Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the PAGA, for civil penalties pursuant to Defendants' violations
22 of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 229, 246(l), 510,
23 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698, 2699 *et seq.*,
24 2800, and 2802, and IWC Wage Orders;

25 52. Upon this Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code
26 sections 210, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute; and

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

28 ///

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dated: November 27, 2023

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: 
Douglas Han
Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh
Halina E. Szymanski
Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

September 11, 2023

BY EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

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

Re: M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, INC. D/B/A MAT EXPRESS

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Rodolfo Sanchez against M.A.T. Parcel Express, Inc. d/b/a MAT Express (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (collectively referred to as "M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS").

Mr. Sanchez is pursuing his California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Sanchez 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.

M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS is a California corporation headquartered at 3495 Kurtz Street, San Diego, California 92110.

M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS employed Mr. Sanchez as an hourly-paid, non-exempt Customer Service Agent from June 27, 2019 to December 29, 2019 in the State of California. M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS directly controlled the wages, hours, and/or working conditions of Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Sanchez may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS within the State of California.

///

///

M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly pay minimum wages and overtime wages and for noncompliant meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements, and failed to reimburse all necessary business-related costs and expenses, resulting in other 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. Sanchez has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS 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, 218.5, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 229, 246(l), 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698, 2699 *et seq.*, 2800, and 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, 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. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS maintained policies that pressured Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees to arrive at work earlier than their scheduled shifts to avoid appearing tardy. Yet, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS also had policies that prohibited Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees from clocking in before the start of their scheduled shifts. Next, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS's policies generally discouraged overtime work because these policies required Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees to obtain written authorization from supervisors or managers prior to working overtime hours with the threat of disciplinary action attached. In addition, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS expected Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees to don their personal protective equipment before the start of their shifts. There was also a line of employees attempting to use the timeclock to clock in at the start of the day, thereby forcing Mr. Sanchez and other employees to arrive at work earlier than their scheduled shifts to account for this waiting period. Even after Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees had completed their shifts and clocked out, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS still expected them to continue working off-the-clock (*i.e.*, reorganizing the storage area). Finally, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to factor bonuses into Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for minimum and overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all hours worked.

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, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to pay Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246. This included failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employees' 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. Instead, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS only paid sick leave at Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees' base hourly rate.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 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, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS frequently prevented employees from receiving compliant meal and rest breaks. A combination of M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS assigning heavy workloads, being understaffed, and permitting supervisory interference forced Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees to skip, cut short, and/or take late meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees were pressured into clocking out for full and timely meal breaks and continuing to work to avoid getting in trouble for failing to take compliant meal breaks. M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS would even automatically deduct 30-minute meal breaks from Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees' time records when no meal breaks were recorded. Even after Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees had worked shifts exceeding 10 hours, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to authorize and permit them to take second meal breaks. Finally, despite these facts, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to compensate Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed. Even when M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS paid Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees premium wages, such wages were only paid at their base hourly rate, not their regular rate of pay with bonuses incorporated.

///

///

///

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 his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. 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, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to pay Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees all wages, including as a result of uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid sick leave, unpaid overtime wages, and unpaid premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks owed within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 through 203. Therefore, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

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. California Labor Code section 204 also requires 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. In addition, California Labor Code section 204 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, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to pay Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including as a result of uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid sick leave, unpaid overtime wages, and unpaid premium wages owed for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks owed within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

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, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS did not provide Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees received from M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS 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. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees; (2) total hours worked by Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees; (3) all deductions for Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees; (4) net wages earned by Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees; and (5) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. 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 IWC Wage Order shall be subject to a civil penalty. The civil penalty is 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; and (3) wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.

During the relevant time period, Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 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 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 3 years.

During the relevant time period, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that 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, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS did not provide Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite having constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including work performed during meal and rest 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 his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

During the relevant time period, Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees incurred various necessary business-related expenses that were not fully reimbursed by M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS. Firstly, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS's policies concerning reimbursement attempted to downplay the number and type of reimbursements Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees would be entitled to (*i.e.*, requiring preapproval). Secondly, Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees were required to purchase steel-toed shoes out-of-pocket to effectively perform their duties. Thirdly, Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees were expected to use their personal cell phones for work-related purposes (*i.e.*, communicating with coworkers and supervisors, taking pictures). Yet, M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS failed to reimburse Mr. Sanchez and other aggrieved employees for these business-related expenses.

We believe that Mr. Sanchez and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 229, 246(l), 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698, 2699 *et seq.*, 2800, and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant must send a certified letter to the employer in questions 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. Sanchez will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of M.A.T. PARCEL EXPRESS within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

///

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", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Email Only):

Adam R. Rosenthal

arosenthal@sheppardmullin.com

Gabriella R. Albright

galbright@sheppardmullin.com

Luke J. Bickel

lbickel@sheppardmullin.com

Counsel for M.A.T. Parcel Express, Inc. d/b/a MAT Express

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
9
0

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, CA 91103 and my electronic service address is mluna@justicelawcorp.com

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

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

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

[X]	STATE
0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99

Executed on November 28, 2023, at Pasadena, California.

Madison, Wis.

Madison Luna