

ANTHONY J. ORSHANSKY (SBN 199364)
anthony@counselonegroup.com
JUSTIN KACHADOORIAN (SBN 260356)
justin@counselonegroup.com
P. BARTHOLOMEW QUINTANS (SBN 308085)
bart@counselonegroup.com
COUNSELONE, PC
9465 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 300
Beverly Hills, California 90212
Telephone: (310) 277-9945
Facsimile: (424) 277-3727

Attorneys for Plaintiff Thomas Jenkins, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all similarly situated individuals

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

THOMAS JENKINS, on behalf of himself
and on behalf of all similarly situated
individuals,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES; and DOES 1
through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01056-MWC-AJR

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS,
COLLECTIVE, AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- (1) FAILURE TO PAY ALL
WAGES DUE (FLSA –
29 U.S.C. §§ 206 AND 207);**
- (2) FAILURE TO PAY ALL
MINIMUM WAGES DUE
(CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194,
1194.2, AND 1198; IWC WAGE
ORDER NO. 4-2001); AND**
- (3) PENALTIES PURSUANT TO
CAL. LAB. CODE § 2699(a)
(FOR VIOLATIONS OF CAL.
LAB. CODE § 558)**

1 Plaintiff Thomas Jenkins (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself, all similarly
2 situated individuals, and the general public, and on behalf of the State of California
3 as a private attorney general (pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, et seq.), brings this
4 class, collective, and representative action complaint against Defendant City of Los
5 Angeles (“Defendant” or “the City”), and DOES 1 to 10, inclusive (collectively,
6 “Defendants”), alleging as follows:

7 **I.**

8 **INTRODUCTION AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

9 1. This is a Class, Collective, and Representative Action, pursuant to Fed.
10 R. Civ. P. 23, 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207, and Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, et seq.,
11 respectively, on behalf of Plaintiff and the Classes of individuals described in detail
12 below against Defendants.

13 2. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (as amended 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et
14 seq.) (“FLSA”) provides for minimum standards for both wages and overtime
15 entitlement, and details administrative procedures by which covered work time must
16 be compensated. The provisions of the FLSA provide the courts with substantial
17 authority to stamp out abuses of child labor, equal pay, and portal-to-portal activities,
18 as well as the overtime pay provisions at issue in this action.

19 3. The California Labor Code provides for more protective, more rigid, and
20 more extensive labor standards which apply to all California employees.

21 4. For at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing
22 to the present (the “liability period”), Defendants have had a consistent policy of
23 failing to pay all wages due and all minimum wages due.

24 5. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and members of each Class, brings this
25 action pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, and 1198, the California Industrial
26 Welfare Commission’s (“IWC”) Wage Order No. 4-2001, and 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and
27 207, seeking compensation for all unpaid wages, liquidated damages, injunctive and
28 other equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

6. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all proposed Class members, pursuant to FLSA §§ 6 and 7 (29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207), also seeks liquidated damages for Defendants' failure to pay all wages due.

7. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all Aggrieved Employees pursuant to California’s Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, et seq. (“PAGA”), seeks penalties for Defendants’ various violations of the California Labor Code.

8. Plaintiff complied with the California Tort Claims Act on October 13, 2023 by sending a letter, return receipt requested, to Defendants' Board President and Board Vice President. Plaintiff's claim was deemed denied by Defendants' board pursuant to Cal. Gov't. Code § 911.6(c) on November 27, 2023, because Defendants did not respond to Plaintiff's letter within forty-five days of October 13, 2023.

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. The City removed this action from the Los Angeles County Superior Court to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and asserted in its removal papers that this Court has original jurisdiction based on a federal question pursuant to the FLSA Claims, as well as the state law claims. *See* Dkt. No. 1.

10. This Court also has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because the City is located in this Court's jurisdiction.

11. Venue is proper in the Western Division pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391. The City is a municipality located in the Western Division, and employed Plaintiff and the Class in the Western Division.

III.

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

12. Plaintiff Thomas Jenkins has been employed by Defendants since January 2014 as an employee who was not exempt from the overtime provisions of

1 the FLSA, and performed work for Defendants in the County of Los Angeles, State
2 of California.

3 13. During his work for Defendants, Plaintiff was willfully denied the
4 payment of all wages due during employment, including all minimum and overtime
5 wages.

6 **B. Defendants**

7 14. Defendant City of Los Angeles employed Plaintiff and members of each
8 Class in the County of Los Angeles.

9 15. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate,
10 or otherwise, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, are currently
11 unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names.
12 Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the
13 Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the
14 unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this
15 Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated
16 hereinafter as DOES, when such identities become known.

17 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each
18 Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other
19 Defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent
20 hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants.

21 17. The Defendants named herein as DOES 1 through 10 are and were
22 persons acting on behalf of, or acting jointly with, Defendants, who violated, or
23 caused to be violated, one or more provisions of the California Labor Code as alleged
24 herein.

25 **IV.**

26 **COLLECTIVE AND CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

27 18. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly
28 situated as a Class Action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23. Plaintiff seeks to represent

the following classes composed of and defined as follows:

THE FLSA CLASS

All persons employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in the United States during the period three (3) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the present, plus any additional time tolled by the California State Judicial Council pursuant to Emergency Rule 9 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and continuing through the present, who elect to opt in to this action as a Collective Action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 206, 207 and 216(b).

THE CALIFORNIA CLASS

All persons employed as non-exempt law enforcement officers by Defendants in California at any time since the date three (3) years preceding the filing of this Action, plus any additional time tolled by the California State Judicial Council pursuant to Emergency Rule 9 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and continuing through the present.

19. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under the provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, because: (1) the proposed Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (2) there are questions of law or fact common to the proposed Classes; (3) the claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the proposed Classes; and (4) Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the proposed Classes.

A. Numerosity

20. The potential members of each Class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. While the precise number of members of each Class has not been ascertained at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants currently employ, and during the relevant

1 time periods employed, over 50 persons in the State of California who fall within the
2 Class definitions.

3 21. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant period necessarily
4 increases this number. Plaintiff alleges Defendants' employment records would
5 provide information as to the number and location of members of each Class. Joinder
6 of members of each Class is not practicable.

7 **B. Commonality**

8 22. There are questions of law and fact common to each Class that
9 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of each Class.
10 These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation:

11 a. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and
12 FLSA Class Members, in violation of the FLSA (29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207); and

13 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay all minimum wages due to
14 Plaintiff and California Class Members, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194,
15 1194.2, and 1198, and IWC Wage Order No. 4-2001.

16 **C. Typicality**

17 23. The claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the
18 members of each Class. Plaintiff and the members of each Class sustained injuries
19 and damages arising out of, and caused by, Defendants' common course of conduct
20 in violation of laws, regulations that have the force and effect of law, and statutes as
21 alleged herein.

22 **D. Adequacy of Representation**

23 24. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of
24 the members of each Class. Counsel who represent Plaintiff are competent and
25 experienced in litigating large employment class actions.

26 **E. Superiority of Class Action**

27 25. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and
28 efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all proposed members

1 of each Class is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the proposed
2 Classes predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the
3 proposed Classes. Each member of the proposed Classes has been damaged and is
4 entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and/or practices.

5 26. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to
6 litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties
7 and the judicial system. Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be
8 encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as
9 a class action.

10 V.

11 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE**

14 **(FLSA - 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207)**

15 **(By Plaintiff and the FLSA Class against All Defendants)**

16 27. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 26 above as though fully set
17 forth herein.

18 28. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a collective action under section
19 16(b) of the FLSA (29 U.S.C. § 216(b)).

20 29. This cause of action arises from Defendants' violation of the FLSA (29
21 U.S.C. §§ 201, et seq.), for their failure to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and FLSA
22 Class Members. At all relevant times hereto, Defendants have been an "enterprise
23 engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," as defined under
24 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(C).

25 30. Defendants, individually and collectively, are Plaintiff's and FLSA Class
26 Members' "employer" as defined by the FLSA.

27 31. Defendants, individually and collectively, are an "enterprise" as defined
28 by section 3(r)(1) of the FLSA (29 U.S.C. § 203(r)(1)).

1 32. Defendants, individually and collectively, are an enterprise engaged in
2 commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of section
3 3(s)(1)(c) of the FLSA (29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(C)).

4 33. Defendants' annual gross volume of sales made, or business done,
5 individually and collectively, has exceeded \$500,000 in each of the last three calendar
6 years.

7 34. Plaintiffs and FLSA Class Members are, or were, each an "employee" of
8 Defendants as defined by the FLSA.

9 35. During the entire course of their employment by Defendants, Plaintiff
10 and FLSA Class Members have not been exempt from the overtime wage provisions
11 of the FLSA.

12 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
13 Defendants have required, or require, Plaintiff and FLSA Class Members, as part of
14 their employment, to work without all additional overtime wages, pursuant to 29
15 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1). That section provides the following:

16 Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ
17 any of his employees . . . for a workweek longer than forty hours unless
18 such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of
19 the hours above specified at a rate which is not less than one and one-
half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

20 37. In the performance of their duties for Defendants, Plaintiff and FLSA
21 Class Members often worked more than applicable overtime threshold(s) contained
22 in the FLSA and did not receive all overtime wage compensation for the work, labor,
23 and services they provided to Defendants as required by the FLSA (29 U.S.C. §§ 206
24 and 207).

25 38. On information and belief, the FLSA Class consists of thousands of
26 similarly situated current and former employees of Defendant who have been victims
27 of Defendant's common policies and practices that have violated their rights under
28

1 the FLSA by, among other things, willfully denying them minimum wages and/or
2 overtime compensation. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify this class
3 description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to
4 particular issues.

5 39. As part of their regular business practices, Defendants intentionally,
6 willfully and repeatedly harmed Plaintiff and FLSA Class Members by engaging in a
7 pattern, practice and/or policy of violating the FLSA. This policy and pattern or
8 practice includes, among other things, failing to provide employees with minimum
9 wages and/or overtime compensation for all hours worked as required by the FLSA.

10 40. Defendants did not fully compensate Plaintiff and FLSA Class Members,
11 because they were required to engage in pre-shift and post-shift donning and doffing
12 of uniforms (*e.g.*, trousers, shirt, belt, body camera, and boots), equipment, and special
13 protective gear (*e.g.*, bullet proof vests) that are integral and indispensable to their
14 duties. Officers must check out their body cameras at the station and must return them
15 immediately after their shift. Plaintiff spends between five to fifteen minutes pre-
16 shift/prior to roll call and post-shift/after sign-out donning and doffing at the station's
17 locker room—time that is unscheduled, off-the-clock, and wholly uncompensated.
18 Such donning and doffing occurs at each shift, thus, constitutes a significant number
19 of uncompensated hours annually. Although police officers receive a stipend for costs
20 associated with purchasing, cleaning, and maintaining uniforms and equipment, there
21 is no compensation provided for time spent robing and disrobing. Moreover,
22 Defendants' rules and regulations regarding uniforms and special protective gear are
23 detailed, subject to formal inspection by superior officers and watch commanders, and
24 failure to adhere to uniform requirements could result in discipline. Defendants
25 benefit by receiving a ready and healthy police force that is identifiable by members
26 of the public and safely prepared for tours of duty.

27 41. Defendants maintain policies and practices that serve as *de facto*
28 requirements that Plaintiff and the FLSA Class Members don and doff their uniforms

1 and equipment on Defendants' premises at the station's locker room. Each officer is
2 assigned a locker and, as a general matter due to these requirements, changes at the
3 station. Donning and doffing at the station is understood to protect the dignity of the
4 uniform as well as the safety of the officers. An officer could be put at risk, for
5 example, if perceived as being on duty while still in uniform and running errands on
6 his or her way home. Officers are further required by Defendants to wear and activate
7 body cameras in any investigative or enforcement activity involving a member of the
8 public, which in practice requires officers not to don their uniforms and represent to
9 the public that they are uniformed officers until at the station, where they must check
10 out and don a body camera to be used in all public-facing interactions. Plaintiff and
11 the FLSA Class follow these requirements to don and doff uniforms and equipment
12 on Defendants' premises, but are and were not compensated for this time.

13 42. Additionally, Plaintiff and FLSA Class Members were not paid overtime
14 wages at the correct rate of pay. Defendants failed to properly compute bonuses,
15 commissions, and/or other non-base hourly wages earned by Plaintiff and FLSA Class
16 Members into their regular rate of pay for purposes of paying them overtime wages
17 at the correct rates of pay.

18 43. Defendants' unlawful conduct has been intentional, willful, and in bad
19 faith, and has caused significant damages to Plaintiff and FLSA Class Members.

20 44. The precise amount of unpaid overtime wages will be proven at trial.

21 45. Plaintiff proposes to undertake appropriate proceedings to have FLSA
22 Class Members aggrieved by Defendants' unlawful conduct notified of the pendency
23 of this action and join this action as plaintiffs, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), by
24 filing written consents to joinder with the Court.

25 46. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks judgment against Defendants
26 on his own behalf, and on behalf of FLSA Class Members similarly situated who file
27 written consents to joinder in this action, for all unpaid wages owed by Defendants to
28 Plaintiff and FLSA Class Members, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207, together

1 with an award of an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, and costs,
2 interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees, as provided for under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

3 47. Wherefore, Plaintiff and the FLSA Class he seeks to represent request
4 relief as described below.

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL MINIMUM WAGES DUE**

7 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, & 1198, and IWC Wage Order No. 4-2001)**

8 **(By Plaintiff and the California Class against All Defendants)**

9 48. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 47 above as though fully set
10 forth herein.

11 49. IWC Wage Order No. 4-2001, section 1(B), provides, "Except as
12 provided in Sections 1, 2, 4, 10, and 20, the provisions of this order shall not apply to
13 any employees directly employed by the State or any political subdivision thereof,
14 including any city, county, or special district." Section 4 of that Wage Order governs
15 the payment of minimum wages to employees, and therefore applies to the City,
16 notwithstanding any status it may claim as a political subdivision of the State of
17 California with respect to the provisions of the Wage Order. *See, e.g., Sheppard v. N.*
18 *Orange Cnty. Regl. Occupational Program*, 191 Cal. App. 4th 289, 300 (Cal. App.
19 4th Dist. 2010).

20 50. During the liability period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
21 California Class Members all minimum wages due during the course of employment,
22 in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, and 1198, and IWC Wage Order No.
23 4-2001. Defendants did not fully compensate Plaintiff and California Class Members,
24 because they were required to engage in pre-shift and post-shift donning and doffing
25 of uniforms (*e.g.*, trousers, shirt, belt, body camera, and boots), equipment, and special
26 protective gear (*e.g.*, bullet proof vests) that are integral and indispensable to their
27 duties. Officers must check out their body cameras at the station and must return them
28 immediately after their shift. Plaintiff spends between five to fifteen minutes pre-

1 shift/prior to roll call and post-shift/after sign-out donning and doffing at the station's
2 locker room—time that is unscheduled, off-the-clock, and wholly uncompensated.
3 Such donning and doffing occurs at each shift, thus, constitutes a significant number
4 of uncompensated hours annually. Although police officers receive a stipend for costs
5 associated with purchasing, cleaning, and maintaining uniforms and equipment, there
6 is no compensation provided for time spent robing and disrobing. Moreover,
7 Defendants' rules and regulations regarding uniforms and special protective gear are
8 detailed, subject to formal inspection by superior officers and watch commanders, and
9 failure to adhere to uniform requirements could result in discipline. Defendants
10 benefit by receiving a ready and healthy police force that is identifiable by members
11 of the public and safely prepared for tours of duty.

12 51. Defendants maintain policies and practices that serve as de facto
13 requirements that Plaintiff and the California Class Members don and doff their
14 uniforms and equipment on Defendants' premises at the station's locker room. Each
15 officer is assigned a locker and, as a general matter due to these requirements, changes
16 at the station. Donning and doffing at the station is understood to protect the dignity
17 of the uniform as well as the safety of the officers. An officer could be put at risk, for
18 example, if perceived as being on duty while still in uniform and running errands on
19 his or her way home. Officers are further required by Defendants to wear and activate
20 body cameras in any investigative or enforcement activity involving a member of the
21 public, which in practice requires officers not to don their uniforms and represent to
22 the public that they are uniformed officers until at the station, where they must check
23 out and don a body camera to be used in all public-facing interactions. Plaintiff and
24 the California Class follow these requirements to don and doff uniforms and
25 equipment on Defendants' premises, but are and were not compensated for this time.

26 52. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants in willfully failing to pay
27 all minimum wages due, Plaintiff and California Class Members have been deprived
28 of wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to restitution and

1 recovery of such amounts, plus interest thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs, pursuant
2 to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194, and liquidated damages pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §
3 1194.2.

4 53. Wherefore, Plaintiff and the California Class he seeks to represent
5 request relief as described below.

6 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
7 **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO CAL. LAB. CODE § 2699(a) (FOR**
8 **VIOLATIONS OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 558)**
9 **(By Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants)**

10 54. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 53 above as though fully set
11 forth herein.

12 55. Aggrieved Employees are composed of all persons employed as non-
13 exempt law enforcement officers by Defendants in California at any time since the
14 date one (1) year preceding the filing of this action.

15 56. As a result of the acts alleged above, including the California Labor Code
16 violations set forth above, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Aggrieved
17 Employees, seeks civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, et seq.

18 57. For each such violation, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are
19 entitled to penalties and other relief in an amount to be shown at the time of trial,
20 subject to the following formula for each violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 558, pursuant
21 to Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a):

- 22 • \$50 for the initial violation; and
- 23 • \$100 for each subsequent violation.

24 58. Civil penalties recovered under this cause of action will be allocated 75%
25 to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), and 25%
26 to the Aggrieved Employees.

27 59. On October 13, 2023, Plaintiff sent a letter by online submission to the
28 LWDA, and by certified mail, return receipt requested to Defendants, setting forth the

1 facts and theories of the violations alleged against Defendants, as prescribed by the
2 PAGA. No notice was received by Plaintiff from the LWDA within sixty-five (65)
3 calendar days of October 13, 2023; therefore, pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §
4 2699.3(a)(2)(A), Plaintiff may commence an action to seek civil penalties pursuant to
5 the PAGA.

6 60. Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees he seeks to represent
7 request relief as described below.

8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 10 1. For an order certifying this action as a class action;
- 11 2. For recovery of all unpaid wages and, liquidated damages, attorneys'
12 fees and costs pursuant to the FLSA (29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et seq.), with respect to
13 Plaintiff and FLSA Class Members;
- 14 3. For compensatory damages and liquidated damages pursuant to Cal. Lab.
15 Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, and 1198, and IWC Wage Order No. 4-2001 in the amount of
16 all unpaid minimum wages due to Plaintiff and California Class Members;
- 17 4. For civil penalties and wages pursuant to the PAGA (Cal. Lab. Code §§
18 2698, et seq.) for Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees;
- 19 5. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194
20 and other applicable law;
- 21 6. For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest; and
- 22 7. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

23 Dated: January 7, 2025

COUNSELONE, PC

24
25 By: /s/ Anthony J. Orshansky

26 Anthony J. Orshansky

27 Justin Kachadoorian

28 P. Bartholomew Quintans

Attorneys for Plaintiff Thomas Jenkins

and all similarly situated individuals

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on all issues triable to a jury.

Dated: January 7, 2025

COUNSELONE, PC

By: /s/ Anthony J. Orshansky

Anthony J. Orshansky

Justin Kachadoorian

P. Bartholomew Quintans

Attorneys for Plaintiff Thomas Jenkins,
on behalf of himself and on behalf of all
similarly situated individuals