

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

2 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

3 Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

Piya Mukherjee (State Bar #274217)

4 2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

5 Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

6 Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Electronically
FILED

by Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo

ON

4/9/2024

By

/s/ **Haley Correa**
Deputy Clerk

7 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

8 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

9
10 CELESTE JACOBS, an individual, on behalf of
herself and on behalf of all persons similarly
11 situated,

12
13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 DPR CONSTRUCTION, INC., a Corporation; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

16
17 Defendants.

Case No. 23-CIV-05852

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
2. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
3. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 510;
4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
8. FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
9. FAILURE TO PAY SICK PAY WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201-203, 233, 246; and
10. VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*].

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Celeste Jacobs (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and all other similarly
2 situated current and former employees alleges on information and belief, except for her own acts
3 and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following.

4
5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. DPR Construction, Inc. (“DEFENDANT”) is a corporation that at all relevant
7 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

8 2. DEFENDANT is a commercial general contractor and construction management
9 firm that does business in California.

10 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from October of 2022
11 to August of 2023 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee,
12 paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment
13 of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

14 4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
15 defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California,
16 including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-
17 exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four
18 (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court
19 (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim
20 of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

21 5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred
23 during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT’s policy and practice
24 which failed to lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT’s policy and practice
25 alleged herein was an unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice whereby
26 DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain wages due PLAINTIFF and the other
27 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the

1 future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful
3 conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

4 6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
5 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
6 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious
7 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this
8 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when
9 they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information
10 and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through
11 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings
12 that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

13 7. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them
14 acting on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its
15 authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally
16 participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the
17 conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to
18 the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and
19 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result
20 of the conduct of the Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

21 **THE CONDUCT**

22 8. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT
23 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time
24 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
25 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.
26 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without
27 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,
28 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to

1 be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by
2 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal
3 break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers
4 a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the
6 course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid less
7 than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than
8 "rounded" time. Additionally, DEFENDANT engages in the practice of requiring
9 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work off the clock in that
10 DEFENDANT, as a condition of employment, required these employees to submit to
11 mandatory temperature checks and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior
12 to clocking into DEFENDANT's timekeeping system for the workday. As a result,
13 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeit minimum wage, overtime
14 wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly
15 recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and
16 practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time
17 worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

18 9. State and federal law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal
19 and rest break premiums at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF
20 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive
21 pay that is tied to specific elements of an employee's performance.

22 10. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members' compensation is DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
24 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
25 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
26 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
27 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular
28 rate of pay in order to pay overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and

1 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive
2 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating
3 overtime pay and meal and rest break premium pay. Management and supervisors described
4 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
5 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure
7 to do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and rest break
8 premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

9 11. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute
11 off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF
12 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform
13 work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without
14 receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide
15 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for
16 some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10)
17 hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period
18 times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.
19 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks
20 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy
21 and practice.

22 12. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required from time to time to work in excess of
24 four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees
25 were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at
26 least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten
27 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to
28 time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts

1 worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally,
3 the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-
4 duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an
5 employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so
6 doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and
7 permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all
8 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control
9 over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose
10 controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes
11 back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS Members from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule
13 which states PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members cannot leave the work
14 premises during their rest period.

15 13. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to
16 accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the
17 actual amount of time these employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare
18 Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked, meaning the time during which an
20 employee was subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee was
21 permitted or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT required these employees to work
22 off the clock without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control.
23 As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
24 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all time worked. As a
25 result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited time worked by
26 working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the
27 applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off
28 the clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT fails to pay

1 minimum wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194,
2 1197, and 1197.1.

3 14. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
4 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements
5 which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab.
6 Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an
7 accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages
8 earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
9 amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
10 Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all
11 applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable
12 pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section
13 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and other
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members failed to identify such information. More specifically, the
15 wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When
16 the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total
17 hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from
18 the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an
19 itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et*
20 *seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other
21 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code
22 § 226.

23 15. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be
24 deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
25 the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll
26 period. Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

27 in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided
28 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in
Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial

1 violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee; (2) For
2 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars
3 (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount
4 unlawfully withheld.

5 16. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and members of
6 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members within seven (7) days of the close of the
7 payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to for
8 the “Hourly” regular wage payments.

9 17. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in
11 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt
12 employees earn non-discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate
13 of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
14 Members at their base rates of pay.

15 18. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(l)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
16 employees be calculated by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime
17 premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90
18 days of employment.

19 19. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay
20 at the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members routinely
21 earned non-discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay.
22 However, when sick pay was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and
23 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of
24 pay, as required under Cal. Lab. Code Section 246.

25 20. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF
26 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS their correct wages and accordingly owe
27 waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is
28 informed and believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular
rate was willful, such that PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose

1 employment has separated are entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code
2 Sections 201-203.

3 21. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer
4 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer
5 to said employee." DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFF and
6 other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, made unlawful deductions from
7 compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members,
8 failed to disclose all aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF
9 and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and thereby failed to pay these
10 employees all wages due at each applicable pay period and upon termination. PLAINTIFF
11 and members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS seek recovery of all illegal
12 deductions from wages according to proof, related penalties, interest, attorney fees and costs.

13 22. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
14 PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses
15 incurred by the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct
16 consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California
17 Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses
18 incurred in the course and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly
19 states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures
20 or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
21 duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful,
22 unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

23 23. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
24 CLASS Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own
25 personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
26 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost
27 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit.
28 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by

1 DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their
2 employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to,
4 costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of
5 DEFENDANT.

6 24. Specifically as to PLAINTIFF, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
7 required off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFF as required by the applicable Wage
8 Order and Labor Code and failed to pay PLAINTIFF all minimum and overtime wages due
9 to PLAINTIFF. DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which provided timely off-
10 duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and also failed to compensate PLAINTIFF for
11 PLAINTIFF's missed meal and rest breaks. The nature of the work performed by the
12 PLAINTIFF did not prevent PLAINTIFF from being relieved of all of PLAINTIFF's duties
13 for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to
14 provide PLAINTIFF with the legally required meal periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's
15 business records. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed
16 the sum or value of \$75,000.

17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 25. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of
19 Civil Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section
20 17203. This action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly
21 situated employees of DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

22 26. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
23 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
24 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and
25 facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii)
26 committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS.
28

THE CALIFORNIA CLASS

27. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as a Class Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

28. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

29. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to permit this work.

30. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately for all meal and rest breaks missed as required by California laws. The DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of policy and procedure failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid as required by law. This common business practice is applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a class-wide basis as

1 unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*
2 (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this claim.

3 31. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members is impracticable.

5 32. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under
6 California law by:

- 7 (a) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of , Cal. Bus. &
8 Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL"), by unlawfully, unfairly
9 and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and
10 procedures that failed to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other
11 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked, including
12 minimum wages owed and overtime wages owed for work performed
13 by these employees; and,
- 14 (b) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by
15 failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

17 33. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a
18 Class Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 19 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous
20 that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition
21 of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 22 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief
23 issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS will apply to every member of the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 26 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims
27 of each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all
28 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, was classified as a

1 non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the
2 DEFENDANT's deceptive practice and policy which failed to provide
3 the legally required meal and rest periods to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
4 and thereby underpaid compensation to PLAINTIFF and
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a
6 result of DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the
7 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or
8 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive and unfair
9 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,

- 10 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and
11 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained
12 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation.
13 There are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative
14 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would
15 make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA
16 CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 Members.

18 34. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action
19 is properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 20 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
21 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution
22 of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS will create the risk of:

- 24 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
25 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish
26 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
28

1 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be
3 dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the
4 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to
5 protect their interests.

6 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused
7 to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS,
8 making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA
9 CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT failed to pay all wages due to
10 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;

11 1) With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on
12 behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate
13 exclusively to restitution because through this claim
14 PLAINTIFF seeks declaratory relief holding that the
15 DEFENDANT's policy and practices constitute unfair
16 competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and
17 incidental equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and
18 remedy the conduct declared to constitute unfair competition;

19 (c) Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of
21 California law as listed above, and predominate over any question
22 affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class
23 Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
24 adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

25 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
26 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate
27 actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will
28 be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic

1 losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA CLASS

2 Members when compared to the substantial expense and burden
3 of individual prosecution of this litigation;

4 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
5 litigation that would create the risk of:

6 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
7 individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which
8 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
9 DEFENDANT; and/or,

10 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be
12 dispositive of the interests of the other members not
13 parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or
14 impede their ability to protect their interests;

15 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
16 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting
17 their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT,
18 which may adversely affect an individual's job with
19 DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class Action
20 is the only means to assert their claims through a representative;
21 and,

22 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
23 and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class
24 treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary
25 duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of
26 certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
27 382.
28

1 35. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action
2 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 3 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
4 predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA
5 CLASS Members because the DEFENDANT's employment practices
6 are applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 7 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair
8 and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS because in the context of employment litigation
10 a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
11 will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or
12 adverse impact on their employment;
- 13 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is
14 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before
15 the Court;
- 16 (d) PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not
17 be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action
18 is maintained as a Class Action;
- 19 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
20 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations
21 and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the
22 damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted
23 upon the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 24 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
25 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of
26 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 27 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally
28 applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-

1 wide relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
2 whole;

3 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable
4 from the business records of DEFENDANT; and,

5 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to
6 bring a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and
7 hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to
8 the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

9 36. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and
10 identify by job title each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally
11 subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged.
12 PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles of
13 similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

14
15 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

16 37. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh,
17 Eighth and Ninth causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members
18 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in
19 California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and
20 classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any
21 time during the period three (3) years prior to the filing of the complaint and ending on the
22 date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD")
23 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy for the aggregate
24 claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under five million dollars
25 (\$5,000,000.00).

26 38. DEFENDANT, in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare
27 Commission ("IWC") Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California
28 law, intentionally, knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT

1 failed to correctly calculate compensation for the time worked by PLAINTIFF and the other
2 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and reporting time wages owed to
3 these employees, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required
4 employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work.
5 DEFENDANT has denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members wages to
6 which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly cheat the competition and unlawfully
7 profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA LABOR
8 SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD
9 should be adjusted accordingly.

10 39. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and
11 identify by name and job title, each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been
12 intentionally subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as
13 herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the complaint to include any
14 additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

15 40. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

17 41. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
18 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

- 19 (a) Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and
20 pay compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
21 SUB-CLASS for missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the
22 California Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable
23 California Wage Order;
- 24 (b) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other
25 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate
26 itemized wage statements;
- 27 (c) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the
28 above-listed conduct;

- 1 (d) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of
2 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,
3 (e) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

4 42. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS under California law by:

- 6 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the
7 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
8 CLASS all wages due for overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is
9 liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194;
10 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to
11 accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA
12 LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wage pay for which
13 DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
14 (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and
15 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an
16 accurate itemized statement in writing showing the corresponding
17 correct amount of wages earned by the employee;
18 (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide
19 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
20 SUB-CLASS with all legally required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty
21 (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required off-duty rest breaks;
22 (e) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that
23 when an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the
24 employer must pay the employee all wages due without abatement, by
25 failing to tender full payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the
26 manner required by California law to the members of the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated their
28 employment; and,

- 1 (f) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF
2 and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members with necessary
3 expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties.

4 43. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a
5 Class Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 6 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
7 are so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
8 CLASS Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as
9 a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 10 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief
11 issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply to every member
13 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 14 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims
15 of each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
16 PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
17 SUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who
18 was subjected to the DEFENDANT's practice and policy which failed
19 to pay the correct amount of wages due to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
20 SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a result of
21 DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members
22 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or
23 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, and unfair
24 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,
- 25 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and
26 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and
27 has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in Class
28 Action litigation. There are no material conflicts between the claims of

1 the representative PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make class certification
3 inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
4 will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS Members.

6 44. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action
7 is properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

8 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
9 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution
10 of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA
11 LABOR SUB-CLASS will create the risk of:

- 12 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
13 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which
14 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
15 parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,
16 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a
18 practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members
19 not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede
20 their ability to protect their interests.

21 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have
22 acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide
24 relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a
25 whole in that DEFENDANT fails to pay all wages due. Including the
26 correct wages for all time worked by the members of the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;
28

1 (c) Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of
2 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices
3 and violations of California Law as listed above, and predominate over
4 any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available
6 methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy,
7 including consideration of:

8 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
9 SUB-CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or
10 defense of separate actions in that the substantial expense of
11 individual actions will be avoided to recover the relatively small
12 amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
13 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared
14 to the substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution
15 of this litigation;

16 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
17 litigation that would create the risk of:

18 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
19 individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
20 CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of
21 conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,

22 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a
24 practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other
25 members not parties to the adjudication or substantially
26 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests;

27 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
28 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will

1 avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by
2 DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual's job
3 with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class
4 Action is the only means to assert their claims through a
5 representative; and,

- 6 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
7 and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class
8 treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary
9 duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of
10 certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
11 382.

12 45. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action
13 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 14 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
15 SUB-CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
- 17 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair
18 and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of
20 employment litigation a substantial number of individual
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting
22 their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on
23 their employment;
- 24 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
25 numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;
- 27
28

- 1 (d) PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
2 Members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal
3 redress unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;
- 4 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
5 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations
6 and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the
7 damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted
8 upon the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 9 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
10 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of
11 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 12 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally
13 applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby
14 making final class-wide relief appropriate with respect to the
15 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole;
- 16 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
17 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA
19 CLASS Members who worked for DEFENDANT in California at any
20 time during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and,
- 21 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to
22 bring a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and
23 hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to
24 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

25
26 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

28 **[Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*]**

1 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

2 46. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege
3 and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of
4 this Complaint.

5 47. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. and Prof.
6 Code § 17021.

7 48. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) defines
8 unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section
9 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair
10 competition as follows:

11 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair
12 competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court
13 may make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver,
14 as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by any person of any
15 practice which constitutes unfair competition, as defined in this chapter, or as
16 may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money or property,
17 real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such unfair
18 competition.

19 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

20 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
21 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
22 applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California
23 Labor Code including Sections 204, 210, 221, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
24 1198, 2802 and the Fair Labor Standards Act and federal regulations promulgated
25 thereunder, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant
26 to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct
27 held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

28 50. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were unlawful and
unfair in that these practices violate public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive,
unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or
utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section

1 17203 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages
2 wrongfully withheld.

3 51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and
4 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's policy and practice failed to provide the legally
5 mandated meal and rest periods, the required amount of compensation for missed meal and
6 rest periods and overtime and minimum wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed
7 to reimburse all necessary business expenses incurred, and failed to provide Fair Labor
8 Standards Act overtime wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing to include non-
9 discretionary incentive compensation into their regular rates of pay for purposes of
10 computing the proper overtime pay due to a business practice that cannot be justified,
11 pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements
12 in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue
13 injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including
14 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

15 52. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
16 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and
17 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment
18 with DEFENDANT.

19 53. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
20 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's policies, practices and procedures failed to
21 provide all legally required meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

23 54. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of herself and on behalf of each
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty
25 meal period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of
26 pay for each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for
27 each ten (10) hours of work.
28

1 55. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of herself and each member of the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off
3 duty paid rest period was not timely provided as required by law.

4 56. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
5 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and
6 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time
7 worked, and has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and
8 contract, all to the detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to
9 allow DEFENDANT to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

10 57. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the
11 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the
12 California Labor Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral,
13 unethical, oppressive and unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful,
14 unfair and deceptive business practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et*
15 *seq.*

16 58. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled
17 to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property
18 which DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and
20 unfair business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

21 59. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
22 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful,
23 unfair and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT
24 from engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

25 60. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no
26 plain, speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business
27 practices of DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur
28 unabated. As a result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,

1 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will
2 continue to suffer irreparable legal and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained
3 from continuing to engage in these unlawful and unfair business practices.

4 ///

5 ///

6 ///

7 ///

8 ///

9 ///

10
11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

13 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1]**

14 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**
15 **and Against All Defendants)**

16 61. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
17 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
18 paragraphs of this Complaint.

19 62. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
20 CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the
21 California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for
22 DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

24 63. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and
25 public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

26 64. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by
27 the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less
28 wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

1 65. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid
2 wages, including minimum wage compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs
3 of suit.

4 66. DEFENDANT maintained a wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct
6 amount of time they work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's policy and practice was to
7 unlawfully and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the
8 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

9 67. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without
10 limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of
11 implementing a policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and
12 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum
13 wage pay.

14 68. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
15 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
16 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
17 DEFENDANT acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and
18 other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission
19 requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

20 69. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged
21 herein, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did
22 not receive the correct minimum wage compensation for their time worked for
23 DEFENDANT.

24 70. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT
25 required, permitted or suffered PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
26 Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's
27 control. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
28

1 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked
2 that they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

3 71. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
4 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic
7 injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained
8 according to proof at trial.

9 72. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
10 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for their
11 time worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
12 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice
13 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF
14 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum
15 wages for their time worked.

16 73. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California
17 labor laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
18 CLASS for all time worked and provide them with the requisite compensation,
19 DEFENDANT acted and continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously
20 toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
21 with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the consequences to them, and
22 with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal rights, and otherwise
23 causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of these employees.

24 74. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
25 CLASS therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest,
26 statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT,
27 in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the
28 extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA

LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

///

///

///

///

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation

[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)

75. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though full set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

76. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

77. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

1 78. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not
2 be employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and more than forty (40) hours per
3 workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in
4 amounts specified by law.

5 79. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid
6 wages, including minimum wage and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together
7 with the costs of suit. Cal. Lab. Code § 1198 further states that the employment of an
8 employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is
9 unlawful.

10 80. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required, permitted or suffered by
12 DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked,
13 including overtime work.

14 81. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without
15 limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of
16 implementing a policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by
17 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members and denied accurate
18 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
19 CLASS for overtime worked, including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8)
20 hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any
21 workweek.

22 82. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
23 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
24 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB CLASS Members. DEFENDANT
25 acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in
26 violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and
27 other applicable laws and regulations. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage
28

1 practices as alleged herein, the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive full compensation for overtime worked.

3 83. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
4 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the
5 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. Further,
6 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were not
7 subject to a valid collective bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action
8 contained herein this Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of
9 herself and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS based on DEFENDANT's violations
10 of non-negotiable, non-waiveable rights provided by the State of California.

11 84. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and
12 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have been paid less for
13 overtime worked that they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

14 85. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay the PLAINTIFF and the other
15 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS overtime wages for the time they
16 worked which was in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal.
17 Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194 & 1198, even though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were required to work, and did in fact work, overtime
19 as to which DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by
20 DEFENDANT's business records and witnessed by employees.

21 86. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
22 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
23 CLASS for the true amount of time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
24 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic
25 injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained
26 according to proof at trial.

27 87. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for all

1 overtime worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
2 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice
3 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF
4 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked.

5 88. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California
6 labor laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS for all overtime worked and provide them with the requisite overtime compensation,
8 DEFENDANT acted and continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously
9 toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
10 with a conscious of and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the consequences to them,
11 and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal rights, and
12 otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of these
13 employees.

14 89. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS therefore request recovery of all overtime wages, according to proof, interest,
16 statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT,
17 in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the
18 extent minimum and/or overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their employment,
20 DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these
21 individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
22 penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
23 Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in
24 good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
25 are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

26
27 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

28 **For Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All
Defendants)

90. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

91. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide all the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS did not prevent these employees from being relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from time to time not fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records from time to time. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

92. DEFENDANT further violates California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a meal period was not provided.

93. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

///

///

///

///

///

///

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)

94. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

95. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees from time to time were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules,

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically
2 denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

3 96. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the
4 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA
5 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with
6 the applicable Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular
7 rate of pay for each workday that rest period was not provided.

8 97. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according
10 to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of
11 suit.

12 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **For Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

14 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]**

15 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
16 **Defendants)**

17 98. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
18 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
19 paragraphs of this Complaint.

20 99. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees
21 with
22 an "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

- 23 (1) gross wages earned,
24 (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
25 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
26 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
27 Industrial Welfare Commission,
28 (3) the number of piecerate 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,

1 (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
2 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an
3 employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on
4 the itemized statement,
(8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
(9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

5 100. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
6 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with complete and accurate
7 wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages
8 earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her
9 employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other
10 things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
11 the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the
13 wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total
14 hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to
15 California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to
16 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members failed to identify
17 such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total
18 hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added
19 up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of
20 Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph,
21 DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the
22 requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT from time
23 to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

25 101. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab.
26 Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs
28 expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount

1 of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities.
2 These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of
3 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty
4 dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred
5 dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §
6 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four
7 thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS herein).

9 ///

10 ///

11 ///

12 ///

13 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **For Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

15 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

16 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All**
17 **Defendants)**

18 102. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members
19 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
20 paragraphs of this Complaint.

21 103. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

25 104. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802,
26 by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
27 CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for
28

1 DEFENDANT's benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not
3 limited to, costs related to using their personal cellular phones on behalf of and for the
4 benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR
5 SUB-CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular
6 phones and home offices in order to perform work related job tasks. DEFENDANT's policy
7 and practice was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
8 CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal cellular phones and home
9 offices for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their employment for
10 DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties.
11 DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of this
12 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF
13 and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify
14 and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for
15 these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

16 105. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses
17 incurred by herself and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members in the discharge
18 of their job duties for DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT,
19 with interest at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

20 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **For Failure to Pay Wages When Due**

22 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203]**

23 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**
24 **and Against All Defendants)**

25 106. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
27 paragraphs of this Complaint.
28

107. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides, in relevant part, that:

As used in this article:

(a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.

(b) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the labor to be paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

108. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, "that If an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately."

109. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

110. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' employment contract.

111. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides, in relevant part, that:

If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

112. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members has terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by law. Additionally, at all times during the term of PLAINTIFF's employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members earned and accrued vested vacation and holiday time on the date of their termination pursuant to DEFENDANT's uniform vacation policies and applicable California law. The amount of vacation pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-

1 CLASS Members earned and accumulated is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
2 records. Additionally, DEFENDANT also underpaid accrued vested vacation wages to
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS by failing to pay
4 such wages at the regular rate of pay and more specifically the final rate of pay that included
5 all non-discretionary incentive compensation. Rather than pay vacation wages at the regular
6 rate of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid vacation wages to PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members at their base rates of pay, instead of
8 including all of PLAINTIFF's and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' non-
9 discretionary incentive compensation into the vacation wage payment calculations.
10 DEFENDANT failed to specify in DEFENDANT's written vacation policy the rate at which
11 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR CLASS Members would be paid vacation
12 upon leaving employment with DEFENDANT. As a result of DEFENDANT's unlawful
13 practice, policy and procedure to deny paying the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all of their vested vacation and holiday time,
15 DEFENDANT failed to pay the PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA
16 LABOR SUB-CLASS all vested vacation time as wages due upon employment termination,
17 in violation of the California Labor Code, Sections 201, 202, 203 and 227.3. Similarly,
18 DEFENDANT underpaid waiting time penalties to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
19 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members at their base rates of pay, instead of including all of
20 PLAINTIFF's' and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' non-discretionary
21 compensation into the waiting time penalty calculations. This failure by DEFENDANT is
22 believed to be the result of DEFENDANT's unlawful, unfair and deceptive refusal to
23 provide compensation for earned, accrued and vested vacation and holiday time, as well as
24 the corresponding waiting time penalties that were paid. DEFENDANT perpetrated this
25 unlawful, unfair and deceptive practice to the detriment of the PLAINTIFF and the members
26 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS . DEFENDANT's uniform practice and policy
27 of failing to pay the LABOR SUB-CLASS Members for all vested vacation and holiday
28

1 time accumulated at employment termination violated and continues to violate Section 227.3
2 of the California Labor Code.

3 113. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of herself and the
4 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has terminated
5 and who have not been fully paid their wages due to them, PLAINTIFF demands thirty days
6 of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who
7 terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD and
8 demands an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as
9 allowed by law.

10 ///

11 ///

12 ///

13 ///

14 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages**

16 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 210, 233, 246]**

17 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

18 **and Against All Defendants)**

19 114. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
20 CLASS, reallege and incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior
21 paragraphs of this Complaint.

22 115. Cal Lab. Code § 233 provides that an employer must permit an employee to
23 use accrued sick leave in accordance with Cal Lab. Code § 246.5 at the employee's then
24 current rate of entitlement. Cal Lab. Code § 246 provides that an employee is entitled to
25 sick pay wages for use of accrued sick leave pursuant to Cal Lab. Code § 246.5.
26 Specifically, once accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time, an employee has a vested
27 right to sick pay wages, which an employer must calculate and compensate based on one of
28 two calculations: (i) "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the

1 same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid
2 sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek,” or (ii)
3 “Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated by dividing the employee’s
4 total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in
5 the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.” Under Cal Lab. Code §§ 218 and
6 233, employees may sue to recover underpaid sick pay wages as damages.

7 116. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to
8 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS at the
9 incorrect rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-
10 SUB-CLASS regularly use accrued sick leave in the workweeks in which they also earn
11 non-hourly remuneration. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay
12 wages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS
13 at the base hourly pay, as opposed to the regular rate of pay, which would consider all non-
14 hourly remuneration in addition to base hourly wages, or the rate resulting from dividing the
15 employee’s total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee’s total hours
16 worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. As a result,
17 DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS.

19 117. Cal. Lab. Code § 246 specifically requires that, upon use of accrued sick
20 leave, vested sick pay wages are due and to be paid no later than the payday for the next
21 regular payroll period after accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab.
22 Code § 201 provides that if an employer discharges an employee, wages earned and unpaid
23 at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides
24 that an employee is entitled to receive all unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an
25 employee quits his or her employment, unless the employee has given 72-hour notice of his
26 or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time
27 of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes untimely payments. For example, Cal. Lab. Code §
28 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed in accordance with Cal.

1 Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the
2 due date, and at the same rate until paid, but the wages shall not continue for more than
3 thirty (30) days. Likewise, Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides penalties for untimely payments
4 during employment. Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203, 210 and 218, employees may sue to
5 recover applicable penalties.

6 118. As alleged herein and as a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT
7 routinely underpays sick pay wages and thus did not timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other
8 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all owing and underpaid sick pay
9 wages. As a result, DEFENDANT violates Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 210, 233, and 246,
10 among other Labor Code provisions. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that
11 DEFENDANT was advised by skilled lawyers and knew, or should have known, of the
12 mandates of the Labor Code as it relates to PLAINTIFF's allegations, especially since the
13 California Supreme Court has explained that "[c]ourts have recognized that 'wages' also
14 include those benefits to which an employee is entitled as a part of his or her compensation,
15 including money, room, board, clothing, vacation pay, *and sick pay.*" *Murphy v. Kenneth*
16 *Cole Prods., Inc.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1103 (2007)(emphasis added). Because DEFENDANT
17 willfully fails to timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
18 LABOR-SUB-CLASS all sick pay wages due, DEFENDANT is subject to applicable
19 penalties.

20 119. Such a pattern, practice, and uniform administration of corporate policy is
21 unlawful and entitles PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-
22 SUB-CLASS to underpaid sick pay wages, including interest thereon, applicable penalties,
23 attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

24
25 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act**

27 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*]**

28 **(By PLAINTIFF and Against All Defendants)**

1 120. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set
2 forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

3 121. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
4 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of
5 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under
6 PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to
7 benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution,
8 but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the
9 Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the
10 public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover
11 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA
12 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

13 122. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
14 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
15 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
16 with respect to herself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by
17 DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a
18 third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES")
19 during the time period of October 25, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court (the
20 "PAGA PERIOD").

21 123. On October 25, 2023, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to
22 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
23 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
24 Labor Code § 2699.3. See **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference
25 herein (*PAGA Notice only without draft complaint*). The statutory waiting period for
26 PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to
27 Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA
28

1 pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

3 124. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
4 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
5 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly
6 record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,
7 (d) failed to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for
8 required expenses, and (f) failed to provide wages when due, all in violation of the
9 applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218,
10 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802,
11 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the
12 applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such
13 conduct.¹ PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor
14 Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California
15 for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

16 125. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA
17 PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect
18 PLAINTIFF during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF seeks penalties for those violations
19 that affected the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*
20 2018 AJDAR 12157 (Certified for Publication 12/19/18). The amount in controversy for
21 PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

22
23 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and
25 severally, as follows:

26
27 _____
28 ¹Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor
Code §558(a)(3).

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- A) That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- B) An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
- C) An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and,
- D) Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:

- A) That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- B) Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- C) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;
- D) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;

- 1 E) For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and
2 1197;
- 3 F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
4 LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and
5 costs of suit.; and,
- 6 G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR
7 SUB-CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or
8 until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 9 3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES:
- 11 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private
12 Attorneys General Act of 2004.
- 13 4. On all claims:
- 14 A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
15 B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,
16 C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the
17 law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §221, §226, §1194,
18 and/or §2802.

19
20 Dated: April 9, 2024

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

21
22 By: /s/ Norman B. Blumenthal
23 Norman B. Blumenthal
24 Nicholas J. De Blouw
25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
26
27
28

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 A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF demands a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

Dated: April 9, 2024

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: /s/ Norman B. Blumenthal
Norman B. Blumenthal
Nicholas J. De Blouw
Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

EXHIBIT -1

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

**2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:

Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:

1004

October 25, 2023

CA3112

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

**Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing**

**DPR Construction, Inc.
Certified Mail #9589071052700182377249
CT Corporation System
Amanda Garcia
330 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203**

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 et seq., 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by DPR Construction, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with DPR Construction, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of October 25, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Celeste Jacobs (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against DPR Construction, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed from October 2022 to August of 2023 by Defendant in California. Plaintiff was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting

time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.