

David Keledjian, Esq. (SBN 309135)
David Arakelyan, Esq. (SBN 337076)
D.LAW, INC.
250 N Madison Avenue, 2nd Floor
Pasadena, CA 91101-1639
Tel.: (818) 962-6465 / Fax: (818) 962-6469
Emails: D.Keledjian@d.law, D.Arakelyan@d.law
Attorneys for Plaintiff JAVIER AVILA

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

JAVIER AVILA, on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated, and the general
public,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAGUNA MAR LLC, a California
corporation; MERCEDES-BENZ OF
LAGUNA NIGUEL, an entity of unknown
form; MURGADO AUTOMOTIVE GROUP,
an entity of unknown form; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2026-01565220-CU-OE-CXC

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

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Pay Hourly Wages and Overtime (Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198);
2. Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198);
4. Failure to Pay Proper Vacation Wages (Lab. Code § 227.3);
5. Failure to Indemnify (Lab. Code § 2802);
6. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*);
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Written Wage Statements (Lab. Code §§ 226(a));
8. Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203); and
9. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff JAVEIR AVILA (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, the
2 State of California, and the general public, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action against Defendants LAGUNA
5 MAR LLC, a California corporation; MERCEDES-BENZ OF LAGUNA NIGUEL, an entity of
6 unknown form; MURGADO AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, an entity of unknown form, and DOES 1
7 through 50, inclusive, (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for alleged violations of the
8 California Labor Code and California Business and Professions Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff
9 alleges that Defendants have:

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

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

27 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

28 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the monetary

1 damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff from Defendants' conduct exceeds the minimal
2 jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.

3 3. Venue is proper in the County of Orange pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections
4 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose this county because at least some of the transactions that are
5 the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found, maintains
6 offices, transacts business and/or has an agent therein.

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

10 **PARTIES**

11 5. Plaintiff JAVIER AVILA is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, was an
12 individual residing in the State of California.

13 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant LAGUNA
14 MAR LLC is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, was a California corporation doing business
15 in the State of California.

16 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant MERCEDES-
17 BENZ OF LAGUNA NIGUEL is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, was an entity of
18 unknown form doing business in the State of California.

19 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant MURGADO
20 AUTOMOTIVE GROUP is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, was an entity of unknown
21 form doing business in the State of California.

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

1 defendants when ascertained.

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

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

12 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted in all
13 respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, that Defendants carried out a
14 joint scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and that the acts of each
15 Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants acted in all
16 respects as the employers or joint employers of Employees. Defendants, and each of them, exercised
17 control over the wages, hours or working conditions of Employees, or suffered or permitted
18 Employees to work, or engaged, thereby creating a common law employment relationship, with
19 Employees. Therefore, Defendants, and each of them, employed or jointly employed Employees.

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

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

- 26 a. **Hourly Employee Class:** All persons employed by Defendants, collectively or
27 separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in hourly or
28 non-exempt positions in California four years prior to the filing of this action and
ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action (“Hourly Employee
Class”).

- 1 b. **Meal Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked in
2 a shift in excess of five hours during the four years prior to the filing of this action
and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 3 c. **Rest Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked a
4 shift of at least three and one-half (3.5) hours the four years prior to the filing of
this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 5 d. **Vacation Pay Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California who
6 earned paid vacation time and/or paid time off without receiving compensation for
all vested paid vacation time during the **Relevant Time Period**.
- 7 e. **Expense Reimbursement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in
8 California who incurred business expenses during the **Relevant Time Period**.
- 9 f. **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
10 separated from their employment with Defendants during the period beginning
three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is
entered.
- 11 g. **Wage Statement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California during
12 the period beginning one year before the filing of this action and ending when final
judgment is entered.
- 13 h. **UCL Sick-Pay Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California who, at
14 any time from four years prior to the filing of this action and ending on the date
that final judgment is entered in this action, worked for more than 30 days for
15 Defendants, and were not paid for at least one hour of sick time for every 30 hours
of work thereafter, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12-month period of
16 employment.
- 17 i. **UCL Unlawful Deduction Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members
18 whose wages were deducted for uniform payments at anytime from four year prior
to the filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in
this action.
- 19 j. **UCL Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** and **Expense Reimbursement Class**
20 members employed by Defendants in California during the four years prior to the
filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
21 action.

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

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

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

- 4 a. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class
- 5 members for all time worked;
- 6 b. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
- 7 employees with their meal periods;
- 8 c. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
- 9 employees with their rest periods;
- 10 d. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members when they
- 11 have not been provided with meal and rest periods at the appropriate rates of pay;
- 12 e. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse class members for all necessary business
- 13 expenses incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- 14 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay proper sick time pay;
- 15 g. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of unlawfully collecting
- 16 and/or receiving wages;
- 17 h. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that
- 18 Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition;
- 19 i. Whether Defendants failed to provide class members with accurate written wage
- 20 statements as a result of providing them with written wage statements with
- 21 inaccurate entries for, among other things, amounts of gross and net wages, and
- 22 total hours worked;
- 23 j. Whether Defendants applied policies or practices that result in late and/or
- 24 incomplete final wage payments; and
- 25 k. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under
- 26 Labor Code section 203.

27 18. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other class members' claims. Plaintiff
28 is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants have a policy or practice of failing

1 to comply with the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code as alleged in this
2 Complaint.

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

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

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

21 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

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

24 23. Defendants misclassified class members as exempt employees in violation of Labor
25 Code Section 515 as class members were primarily engaged in non-exempt hourly work under
26 Defendants'

27 24. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff
28 and Class Members proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First,

1 Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and
2 reduced the actual working hours recorded by Plaintiff and Class Members, and upon which their pay
3 was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Plaintiff and Class Members, and these
4 unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage
5 statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying
6 Plaintiff and Class members only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours
7 they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and results,
8 over time, to the detriment of the Plaintiff and Class members by systematically undercompensating
9 them.

10 25. Additionally, Plaintiff and Class Members were consistently required to perform
11 work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members
12 were systemically required to perform work both before clocking in for their shifts and after clocking
13 out for the day, including having to help out at company events and responding to calls and text
14 messages from management and customers using their personal cellular phones. Additionally,
15 Plaintiff and Class Members were required to work during their unpaid meal periods to perform
16 various work-related tasks. The foregoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction
17 and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

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

21 27. Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members overtime wages at the
22 proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members earned
23 commissions, spiff pay, as well as performance-based non-discretionary bonuses in addition to their
24 hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted for when determining Plaintiff
25 and Class Members' regular rates of pay, and respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

26 28. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
27 Class Members the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law.
28 Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to carry their personal cellular phones and

1 respond to work-related telephone calls during unpaid meal periods. Additionally, due to
2 understaffing and heavy workloads, Plaintiff and Class Members were denied the opportunity to take
3 timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work. Furthermore, Plaintiff and
4 Class Members were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to
5 keep working during meal breaks, including responding to customer calls. Finally, the uncompensated
6 pre-shift duties, discussed herein, delayed Plaintiff and Class Members' meal periods to commence
7 after the completion of their fifth and tenth hours of work.

8 29. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30)
9 minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal
10 period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to
11 take their meal periods, or that advised Class Members of their meal and rest period rights; and (3)
12 Defendants' practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their meal and
13 rest periods due to the excessive workload.

14 30. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
15 Class Members the opportunity to take rest periods in compliance with the California Law. Plaintiff
16 and Class Members were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4)
17 hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest
18 period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2)
19 no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods,
20 or that properly advised Plaintiff and Class Members of their rest period rights; and (3) Defendants'
21 policy and practice of requiring class members to continue working through their rest breaks due to
22 the excessive workload, including having to keep and monitor their personal cellular phones during
23 meal periods and rest breaks. Additionally, Plaintiff and Class Members were not separately paid for
24 rest breaks, at their appropriate regular rate of pay, when they earned all incentive-based pay, in lieu
25 of hourly wages.

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

28 32. Defendants also had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay

1 Plaintiff and Class Members the requisite and accrued vacation time pay in accordance with
2 California Law. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members accrued vested vacation time and/or paid
3 time off. However, Defendants failed to pay all accrued vacation time and/or paid time off owed to
4 Plaintiff and Class Members upon their separation from employment. Additionally, the vacation pay
5 paid, or owing, to Plaintiff and Class Members did not account for the performance-based non-
6 discretionary bonuses and/or commission earnings, which were never factored into the rate upon
7 which sick pay was accrued and paid.

8 33. Plaintiff and Class Members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in
9 executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were
10 required to use their personal cellular phones to communicate with clients and management, which
11 was necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ. Plaintiff and Class members were
12 not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses

13 34. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff
14 and Class Members the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically,
15 Plaintiff and Class Members worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least
16 one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12 month
17 period of work.

18 35. Defendant had a common policy and practice of unlawfully collecting and receiving
19 wages from Plaintiff and Class Members. Specifically, Defendants deducted what they called "taxes"
20 from Plaintiff's and Class Members' Cellular Phone Allowance.

21 36. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with accurate wage statements as
22 mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage
23 statements as "a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or
24 separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing."
25 Additionally, the wage statements issued to Plaintiff and Class Members were not recorded in "ink
26 or other indelible form."

27 37. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as "gross wages
28 earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

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

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

40. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(8) as the wage statements issues to Plaintiff and Class Members failed to state “the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.”

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES

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

(Plaintiff and Hourly Employee Class)

43. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

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

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

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

4 47. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
5 employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under the applicable Wage
6 Order.

7 48. Labor Code section 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover liquidated
8 damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon in addition
9 to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon.

10 49. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less
11 than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a
12 payroll period.

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

16 51. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ employees under
17 conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

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

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

24 54. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order require employees
25 to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than one and one-half (1.5) times their
26 respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, all
27 hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and/or for the first eight (8) hours
28 worked on the seventh consecutive day of one workweek.

1 55. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order also require
2 employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than two (2) times their respective
3 regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for all
4 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on a seventh consecutive workday during the workweek.

5 56. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, Defendants have applied
6 centrally devised policies and practices to him and **Hourly Employee Class** members with respect to
7 working conditions and compensation arrangements.

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

11 58. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were not paid proper wages and
12 overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Defendants implemented an unlawful
13 time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours
14 recorded by Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members, and upon which their pay was based,
15 and generally did so to the detriment of the Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members, and these
16 unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage
17 statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying
18 Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members only for the hours they were scheduled to work,
19 rather than the hours they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is
20 not neutral and results, over time, to the detriment of the Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
21 members by systematically undercompensating them.

22 59. Additionally, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were consistently
23 required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff
24 and **Hourly Employee Class** members were systemically required to perform work both before
25 clocking in for their shifts and after clocking out for the day, including having to help out at company
26 events and responding to calls and text messages from management and customers using their
27 personal cellular phones. Additionally, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were required
28 to work during their unpaid meal periods to perform various work-related tasks. The foregoing and

1 uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages
2 were paid.

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

7 61. Defendants also failed to Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members overtime
8 wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
9 **Class** members earned commissions, spiff pay, as well as performance-based non-discretionary
10 bonuses in addition to their hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted
11 for when determining Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members' regular rates of pay, and
12 respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

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

17 63. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 218.6, 223, 510, 1194 and 1194.2, Plaintiff, on
18 behalf of himself and **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid straight time and
19 overtime wages, interest thereon and costs of suit.

20 64. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
21 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and
22 **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

23 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

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

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

27 65. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if
28 fully alleged herein.

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

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

9 68. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare
10 Commission Wage Order (“Wage Order”) both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work
11 during required meal periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of
12 premium wages on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required meal period.

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

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

17 71. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:
18 No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than
19 five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except
20 that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete
21 the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of
22 the employer and employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty
23 during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an
24 ‘on duty’ meal period and counted as time worked. An ‘on duty’ meal
25 period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
26 employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written
27 agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed
28 to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing,
 revoke the agreement at any time.

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

28 73. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,

1 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
2 **Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5)
3 hour work period, as required by Labor Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order.
4 Specifically, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were required to carry their personal
5 cellular phones and respond to work-related telephone calls during unpaid meal periods. Additionally,
6 due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were
7 denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work.
8 Furthermore, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not relieved of all work duties
9 during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep working during meal breaks, including
10 responding to customer calls. Finally, the uncompensated pre-shift duties, discussed herein, delayed
11 Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members' meal periods to commence after the completion of
12 their fifth and tenth hours of work.

13 74. Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with meal periods
14 of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not
15 scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that
16 encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised **Meal Period Sub-Class** members
17 of their meal and rest period rights; and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring **Meal Period Sub-Class**
18 members to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

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

22 76. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
23 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
24 **Sub-Class** with a second meal period when they worked shifts of ten (10) or more hours and failed
25 to pay them premium wages as required by Labor Code 512 and the applicable Wage Order.

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

28 78. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-**

1 **Class** members additional premium wages, and/or were not paid premium wages at the employees'
2 regular rates of pay when required meal periods were not provided.

3 79. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6, 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff, on behalf of
4 himself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest
5 thereon, and costs of suit.

6 80. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
7 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the
8 **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

9 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS**

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

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

13 81. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
14 herein.

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

18 83. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order imposes an affirmative obligation on
19 employers to permit and authorize employees to take required rest periods at a rate of no less than ten
20 (10) minutes of net rest time for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, that must
21 be in the middle of each work period insofar as practicable.

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

26 85. Compensation for missed rest periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor
27 Code section 200.

28 86. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that

1 violate the Wage Order.

2 87. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
3 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing members of the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
4 with net rest period of at least ten (10) uninterrupted minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or
5 major fraction thereof, as required by the applicable Wage Order.

6 88. Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with rest periods of
7 at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1)
8 Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second
9 rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that
10 encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised **Rest Period Sub-Class**
11 members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring **Rest Period**
12 **Sub-Class** members to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workloads,
13 including having to keep and monitor their personal cellular phones during meal periods and rest
14 breaks. Additionally, Plaintiff and **est Period Sub-Class** members were not separately paid for rest
15 breaks, at their appropriate regular rate of pay, when they earned all incentive-based pay, in lieu of
16 hourly wages.

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

19 90. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself
20 and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and
21 costs of suit.

22 91. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
23 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Rest**
24 **Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY VACATION WAGES

(Lab. Code § 227.3)

(Plaintiff and Vacation Pay Class)

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

93. California Labor Code section 227.3 provides:

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

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

95. However, Defendants implemented a common policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and **Vacation Pay Class** members for all accrued vacation wages upon separation of employment, in violation of Labor Code 227.3. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Vacation Pay Class** members accrued vested vacation time and/or paid time off. However, Defendants failed to pay all accrued vacation time and/or paid time off owed to Plaintiff and **Vacation Pay Class** members upon their separation from employment. Additionally, the vacation pay paid, or owing, to Plaintiff and **Vacation Pay Class** members did not account for the performance-based non-discretionary bonuses and/or commission earnings, which were never factored into the rate upon which sick pay was accrued and paid.

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

97. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the members of the **Vacation Pay Class**, seeks

1 interest thereon pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6, costs pursuant to California
2 Labor Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil
3 Procedure section 1021.5.

4 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY**

6 **(Lab. Code § 2802)**

7 **(Plaintiff and Reimbursement Class)**

8 98. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
9 herein.

10 99. Labor Code section 2802(a) states:

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

16 100. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not reimbursed for
17 business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff
18 and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were required to use their personal cellular phones to
19 communicate with clients and management, all necessary to perform, their duties under Defendants'
20 employ. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class Members** were not reimbursed for these
21 necessary work-related expenses.

22 101. Accordingly, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members are entitled to
23 restitution for all unpaid amounts due and owing to within four (4) years of the date of the filing of
24 the Complaint and until the date of entry of judgment.

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

28 ///

///

///

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

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

4 **(Plaintiff and the UCL Sub-Classes)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 108. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff
25 and **UCL Sick Pay Class** Members the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law.
26 Specifically, Plaintiff and **Sick Pay Class** Members worked for Defendants for more than 30 days,
27 but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick
28 time for every 12 month period of work. Additionally, the sick pay paid to Plaintiff and **UCL Sick**

1 **Pay Class** Members did not account for the shift differential pay as well as performance-based non-
2 discretionary bonuses, which were never factored into the rate upon which sick pay was accrued and
3 paid.

4 109. Therefore, **UCL Sick Pay Class** Members are owed the unpaid balance of said
5 wages pursuant to the Wage order according to proof at trial, interest pursuant to Labor Code §§
6 218.6 and 1194(a), Civil Code §§ 3287 and § 3289, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and/or
7 penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a).

8 110. Labor Code § 221 provides, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or receive
9 from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee." As
10 discussed above, Defendants unlawfully received and/or collected wages from employees.
11 Specifically, Defendants unlawfully deducted vested wages from Plaintiff and **UCL Unlawful**
12 **Deduction Sub-Class** Members from cellular phone allowance.

13 111. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that all or substantially all the
14 **UCL Unlawful Deduction Sub-Class** are subject to Defendants' policies and practices of making the
15 unlawful deductions from their wages, as discussed herein.

16 112. Therefore, **UCL Unlawful Deduction Sub-Class** Members are owed the unpaid
17 balance of said wages pursuant to the Wage order according to proof at trial, Interest pursuant to
18 Labor Code §§ 218.6 and 1194(a), Civil Code §§ 3287 and § 3289, and reasonable attorneys' fees and
19 costs and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a).

20 113. Additionally, California law requires employers to pay hourly, non-exempt employees
21 for all hours they are permitted or suffered to work, including hours that the employer knows or
22 reasonable should know that employees have worked.

23 114. Plaintiff and the **UCL Class** members re-allege and incorporate the FIRST, SECOND,
24 THIRD, FOURTH, SIXTH, AND EIGHTH causes of action herein.

25 115. Plaintiff lost money or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair competition.

26 116. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair competition.

27 117. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that by committing the Labor
28 Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 215, 216, 221,

1 225, 226.6, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 354, 408, 512, 510, 553, 1175, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1,
2 1198, 1199, and 2802 as well as applicable Wage Orders, which make it a misdemeanor to commit
3 the violations alleged herein.

4 118. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and practices of,
5 *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an employer to: provide non-exempt
6 employees with compliant meal and rest periods; pay for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay;
7 pay proper sick time pay; and reimburse for necessary business expenditures.

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

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

17 121. Plaintiff is informed and believes that other similarly situated persons have been
18 subject to the same unlawful policies or practices of Defendants.

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

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

25 124. Accordingly, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 17203,
26 Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
27 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
28 Code and applicable Wage Orders.

1 125. Accordingly, pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200 and 17203, Plaintiff
2 requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
3 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
4 Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders; and upon a final hearing seeks
5 an order permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and
6 employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
7 Wage Orders.

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

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

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

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

22 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

24 **(Lab. Code § 226)**

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

26 130. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
27 herein.

28 131. Labor Code section 226(a) states:

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

132. The Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("DLSE") has sought to harmonize the
"detachable part of the check" provision and the "accurate itemized statement in writing" provision
of Labor Code section 226(a) by allowing for electronic wage statements so long as each employee
retains the right to elect to receive a written paper stub or record and that those who are provided with
electronic wage statements retain the ability to easily access the information and convert the electronic
statements into hard copies at no expense to the employee. (DLSE Opinion Letter July 6, 2006).

133. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
limitations period, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members
with written wage statements as described above. Additionally, the wage statements issued to class
members failed to account for the unpaid minimum wages, overtime, and premium pay wages
described above.

134. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class**

1 Members with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE
2 Opinion Letters. Plaintiff's and **Wage Statement Class** members' wage statements were only
3 provided in electronic format in violation of Labor Code § 226.

4 135. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(8) as the wage statements
5 issues to Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** Members failed to state "the name and address of the
6 legal entity that is the employer."

7 136. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and
8 **Wage Statement Class** members with accurate written wage statements was intentional in that
9 Defendants have the ability to provide them with accurate wage statements but have intentionally
10 provided them with written wage statements that Defendants have known do not comply with Labor
11 Code section 226(a).

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

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

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **(Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **CIVIL PENALTIES**

7 **(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

8 148. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

9 149. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§
10 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174,
11 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802.¹

12 150. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself
13 and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover civil penalties
14 pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not, be brought or
15 maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

16 151. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the
17 alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee
18 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt
19 hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of
20 Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing
21 through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as
22 "Aggrieved Employees")

23 152. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code §
24 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA")
25

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

1 and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an intent to
2 investigate.

3 153. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil
4 penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7,
5 226.8, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198,
6 1199, and 2802:

- 7 i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3,
8 246 1174, 1194, 1198 and 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee
9 per pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for
10 each employee per pay period for each subsequent violation (penalties set by
11 Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
- 12 ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty
13 (30) days' pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);
- 14 iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
15 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
16 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully
17 withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful
18 or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-
19 five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee,
20 for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation
21 was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);
- 22 iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
23 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
24 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of
25 the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation
26 that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
27 employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld
28 from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the

subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 225.5);

v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial citation, two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before the filing of this action, one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each employee for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);

vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each subsequent pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code § 558);

vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1);

viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

- a. An order that the action be certified as a class action;
- b. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;
- c. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;
- d. Unpaid wages and overtime;

- e. Actual damages;
- f. Liquidated damages;
- g. Unreimbursed expenses;
- h. Restitution;
- i. Declaratory relief;
- j. Pre-judgment interest;
- k. Statutory penalties;
- l. Civil penalties;
- m. Costs of suit;
- n. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- o. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: July 2, 2026

D.LAW, INC.



David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
JAVIER AVILA, and the putative class

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

Dated: July 2, 2026

D.LAW, INC.



David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
JAVIER AVILA, and the putative class

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

3 I, the undersigned, am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business
4 address is 250 N Madison Ave., 2nd Floor, Pasadena, CA 91101, which is located in Los Angeles
County, where the service herein occurred.

5 On the date of execution hereof, I caused to be served the following attached document/s:

6 **PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION**
7 **COMPLAINT**

8 on the interested parties in this action, addressed as follows:

9 Andrew Hoag
10 Jeremy Stern
11 Griselda Luna
12 Amy Stark
13 FISHER PHILLIPS
14 444 South Flower Street, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel.: (213) 402-9568
Emails: ahoag@fisherphillips.com
jestern@fisherphillips.com
gluna@fisherphillips.com
astark@fisherphillips.com

15 using the following service method(s):

16 **X** **VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL:** Service by electronic mail to parties who have already
17 appeared in this post-January 1, 2019 proceeding was made pursuant to the procedures specified
18 in California Code of Civil Procedure § 1010.6(b). The electronic mail was sent to electronic
service address(es) that has/have been previously confirmed by email.

19 **VIA MAIL:** I caused the document(s) to be served to be deposited at: 450 North Brand
20 Boulevard, Suite 840, Glendale, California, which is a mailbox or other like facility regularly
maintained by the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope, with postage paid,
21 addressed to the person(s) on whom the document(s) is/are to be served, at the office address as
last given by that/those person(s), otherwise at that/those person(s)' place(s) of residence. I am
22 aware that on motion of any party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation
date or postage meter date is more than one (1) day after the date of deposit for mailing stated
23 herein.

24 **VIA EXPRESS MAIL:** I caused the document(s) to be served to be deposited in a box
or other facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier, or delivered to an authorized
25 courier or driver authorized by the express service carrier to receive documents, in a sealed
envelope or package designated by the express service carrier with delivery fees paid or provided
26 for, addressed to the person(s) on whom the document(s) is/are to be served, at the office address
as last given by that/those person(s), otherwise at that/those person(s)' place(s) of residence.

27 **VIA PERSONAL DELIVERY:** I caused the document(s) to be served to be personally
delivered by hand to the addressee(s) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1011.

28 **VIA PERSONAL DELIVERY:** I caused the document(s) to be served to be personally

delivered by hand on XXXXX(Date) to the addressee(s) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1011.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL: Service by electronic mail was made either pursuant to a Court Order, pursuant to agreement between the parties permitting the same, or as a professional courtesy in addition to other proper service. The electronic mail was sent to an electronic mail address maintained by the person(s) on whom the document(s) is/are served as last given by that/those person(s). I personally requested a “delivery receipt” for this electronic mail message, and, unless disallowed by the recipient, received the same.

VIA ELECTRONIC SERVICE: Service was made pursuant to Court Order. The document(s) were filed and served to all parties via the Court-approved LexisNexis “File and Serve” service OR Case Anywhere service.

VIA ELECTRONIC SERVICE: The above documents were electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which sent notification of such filing to the above interested parties.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **July 2, 2026**, at Pasadena, California.



Jordan Floyd