

**Electronically Filed
by Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara,
on 12/21/2023 3:42 PM
Reviewed By: R. Walker
Case #23CV424955
Envelope: 13934113**

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff ORGIL KHATANBAATAR

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

ORGIL KHATANBAATAR, on behalf of
herself and all others similarly situated, and
the general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

INFOGAIN TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a
California corporation; ADVANCED
RESOURCE STAFFING, a business entity of
unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23CV424955

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

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

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

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff ORGIL KHATANBAATAR (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself, all others similarly
2 situated, the 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 INFOGAIN
5 TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a California corporation; ADVANCED RESOURCE STAFFING, a
6 business entity of unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively referred to as
7 “Defendants”) for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and California Business and
8 Professions Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have:

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

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

24 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

28 3. Venue is proper in the County of Santa Clara pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure

1 sections 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose this county because at least some of the transactions
2 that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found,
3 maintains offices, transacts business and/or has an agent therein.

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

7 **PARTIES**

8 5. Plaintiff ORGIL KHATANBAATAR is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein,
9 an individual residing in the State of California.

10 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant INFOGAIN
11 TECHNOLOGIES, INC. is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing
12 business in the State of California.

13 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant ADVENCED
14 RESOURCE STAFFING is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a business entity of unknown
15 form doing business in the State of California.

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

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

1 defendants.

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

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

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

- 12 a. **Hourly Employee Class:** All persons employed by Defendants, collectively or
13 separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in hourly or
14 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”).
- 15 b. **Meal Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked in
16 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.
- 17 c. **Rest Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked a
18 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.
- 19 d. **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
20 separated from their employment with Defendants during the period beginning
three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is
21 entered.
- 22 e. **Sick-Pay Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California who, at any
23 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
24 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
employment.
- 25 f. **Wage Statement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California during
26 the period beginning one year before the filing of this action and ending when final
judgment is entered.
- 27 g. **Expense Reimbursement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in
28 California who incurred business expenses during the **Relevant Time Period**.

1 h. **UCL Class**: All **Hourly Employee Class** and **Expense Reimbursement Class**
2 members employed by Defendants in California during the four years prior to the
3 filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
4 action.

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

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

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

- 15 a. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
16 employees with their rest periods;
- 17 b. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
18 employees with their meal periods;
- 19 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members when they
20 have not been provided with meal and rest periods at the appropriate rates of pay;
- 21 d. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class
22 members for all time worked;
- 23 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay proper sick time pay;
- 24 f. Whether Defendants failed to provide class members with accurate written wage
25 statements as a result of providing them with written wage statements with
26 inaccurate entries for, among other things, amounts of gross and net wages, and
27 total hours worked;
- 28 g. Whether Defendants applied policies or practices that result in late and/or
incomplete final wage payments;

- h. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse class members for all necessary business expenses incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- i. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under Labor Code section 203; and
- j. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition.

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

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

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

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

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

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

21. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff and Class members proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours recorded by Plaintiff and Class Members, and upon which their pay was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Plaintiff and Class Members, and these unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Plaintiff and Class members only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and results, over time, to the detriment of the Plaintiff and Class members by systematically undercompensating them.

22. Furthermore, Plaintiff and Class Members were instructed to understate their time records to reflect fewer hours than actually worked.

23. Next, Plaintiff and Class Members were also consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were systemically required to work beyond the eight (8) hours that Defendants demanded Plaintiff and Class Members logged daily. Further, Plaintiff and Class Members consistently were required to work through their mandatory, duty-free meal periods. Defendants also required Plaintiff and Class Members to participate in work-related calls and activities for hours while off-the-clock. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

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

25. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and

1 Class Members the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law.
2 Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were systematically denied the opportunity to take meal
3 periods, and were not given the opportunity to clock out for thirty (30) minutes. Defendants also
4 denied Plaintiff and Class Members the opportunity to take second meal breaks on days when Plaintiff
5 and Class Members worked more than ten (10) hours.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

16 35. Plaintiff and Class Members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in
17 executing their duties under Defendant’s employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were
18 required to use their personal cell phones to conduct work activities, including both phone calls and
19 text messages, and incurred costs from the phone use. Additionally, Plaintiff and Class Members were
20 often required to work from home with their work computers, and incurred costs for internet and
21 utilities use, including electricity, gas, water, and rent. However, Defendant never reimbursed
22 Plaintiff and Class Members for these necessary work expenses.

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

28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

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

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

5 37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if
6 fully alleged herein.

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

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

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

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

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

23 43. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:

24 No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than
25 five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except
26 that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete
27 the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of
28 the employer and employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty
during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an
‘on duty’ meal period and counted as time worked. An ‘on duty’ meal
period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written

1 agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed
2 to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing,
revoke the agreement at any time.

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

6 45. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
7 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
8 **Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5)
9 hour work period, as required by Labor Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order.
10 Specifically, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were systematically denied the
11 opportunity to take meal periods, and were not given the opportunity to clock out for thirty (30)
12 minutes. Defendants also denied Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members the opportunity to
13 take second meal breaks on days when Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members worked more
14 than ten (10) hours.

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

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

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

28 49. Moreover, Defendants written policies fail to inform Meal period Class Members of

1 their meal period rights under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

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

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

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

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS**

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

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

15 53. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
16 herein.

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

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

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

28 57. Compensation for missed rest periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor

1 Code section 200.

2 58. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that
3 violate the Wage Order.

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

8 60. Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with rest periods of
9 at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1)
10 Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second
11 rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more and third rest breaks for shifts of ten (10) hours or more;
12 (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest
13 periods, or that properly advised Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members of their rest period
14 rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring **Rest Period Sub-Class** members to continue
15 working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload.

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

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

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

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

28 64. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged

1 herein.

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

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

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

11 68. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
12 employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under the applicable Wage
13 Order.

14 69. Labor Code section 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover liquidated
15 damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon in addition
16 to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon.

17 70. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less
18 than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a
19 payroll period.

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

23 72. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ employees under
24 conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 80. Furthermore, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were instructed to
2 understate their time records to reflect fewer hours than actually worked.

3 81. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were consistently required to perform
4 work, off-the-clock for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
5 **Class** members were systemically required to work beyond the eight (8) hours that Defendants
6 demanded Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members logged daily. Further, Plaintiff and
7 **Hourly Employee Class** members consistently were required to work through their mandatory, duty-
8 free meal and rest periods. Defendants also required Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members
9 to participate in work-related calls and activities for hours while off-the-clock. The forgoing and
10 uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages
11 were paid. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to work
12 in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling
13 Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to minimum and overtime wages, which they were
14 systemically denied.

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

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

22 84. 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 herself and
24 **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY PROPER SICK PAY

(Lab. Code § 246)

(Plaintiff and Sick Pay Class)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

///

///

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS

(Lab. Code § 226)

(Plaintiff and Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class)

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

91. Labor Code section 226(a) states:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 **SIXTH 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 98. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
6 herein.

7 99. 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.

10 100. 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.

12 101. 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.

15 102. 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.

18 103. 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.

22 104. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants' failure to
23 timely pay all final wages to her and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members 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.

27 105. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 203 and 218.6, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself 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.

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

5 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY**

7 **(Lab. Code § 2802)**

8 **(Plaintiff and Reimbursement Class)**

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

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

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

15 109. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not reimbursed for
16 business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff
17 and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were required to use their personal cell phones to
18 conduct work activities, including both phone calls and text messages, and incurred costs from the
19 phone use. Additionally, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were often required
20 to work from home with their work computers, and incurred costs for internet and utilities use,
21 including electricity, gas, water, and rent. However, Defendant never reimbursed Plaintiff and
22 **Expense Reimbursement Class** members for these necessary work expenses.

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

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

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

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

4 **(Plaintiff and UCL Class)**

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

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

9 114. 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.

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

16 116. Plaintiff and the **UCL Class** members re-allege and incorporate the FIRST, SECOND,
17 THIRD, FOURTH, and SEVENTH causes of action herein.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);
- iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld 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 herself, all others similarly situated, the State of California, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

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

Dated: December 21, 2023

D.LAW, INC.



Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORGIL KHATANBAATAR, 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 herself, all other similarly situated, the State of California, and the general public, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: December 21, 2023

D.LAW, INC.



Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
David Keledjian
David Arakelyan
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORGIL KHATANBAATAR, and the putative
class

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

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

Gabriel N. Rubin
Lauretta Adams
JACKSON LEWIS P.C.
50 California Street, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Phone: (415) 394-9400
Counsel for Infogain Technologies, Inc.

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

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

Executed on December 21, 2023, at Glendale, California.

Jordan Floyd