

D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
Emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
Natalie Haritounian (SBN 324318)
n.haritounian@d.law
880 E Broadway
Glendale, CA 91205
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Fax: (818) 962-6469

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
12/08/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: R. Lozano Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff JORDAN MONTREL HARDMAN,
on behalf of himself and others similarly situated

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

JORDAN MONTREL HARDMAN, an
individual on behalf of himself and all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TACI ENERGY SOLUTIONS, INC., a
California Corporation doing business as
TACI LOW VOLTAGE SOLUTIONS;
TURN AROUND COMMUNICATIONS,
INC., a California Corporation;
PEOPLEASE, LLC, a South Carolina limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 23STCV24726

CLASS ACTION

Assigned for All Purposes To:
Hon. David S. Cunningham III
Dept.: 11

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
2. Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Under Labor Code § 510;
3. Meal Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
4. Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
5. Violation of Labor Code § 226(a);
6. Violation of Labor Code § 203;
7. Violation of Labor Code § 204;
8. Failure to Keep Required Payroll Records under Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5;
9. Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses § 2802;
10. Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records Under Labor Code §§ 226(b), 1198.5;
11. Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; and
12. Penalties under PAGA, Labor Code § 2698

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff JORDAN MONTREL HARDMAN (“Plaintiff”) brings this action on behalf of himself and the Class Members who are defined as “all current and former employees within the State of California who, at any time from four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, are or were employed as non-exempt hourly employees by Defendants TACI ENERGY SOLUTIONS INC., a California corporation doing business as TACI LOW VOLTAGE SOLUTIONS, TURN AROUND COMMUNICATIONS, INC., a California corporation, PEOPLEASE, LLC, a South Carolina limited liability company, and DOES 1 through 50” (all defendants being collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”).

2. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of them, violated various provisions of the California Labor Code, relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC), and the California Business & Professions Code, and seeks redress for these violations.

3. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and (1) shared similar job duties and responsibilities; (2) was subjected to the same policies and practices; and (3) endured similar violations at the hands of Defendants as the other Class Members who served in similar and related positions.

THE PARTIES

A. The Plaintiff

4. Plaintiff JORDAN MONTREL HARDMAN resides in California, during the time period relevant to this Complaint, was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee within the State of California.

B. The Defendants

5. Defendant TACI ENERGY SOLUTIONS, INC. is a California corporation doing business as TACI LOW VOLTAGE SOLUTIONS and is registered with the California Secretary of State. Defendant TACI ENERGY SOLUTIONS, INC. d/b/a TACI LOW VOLTAGE SOLUTIONS has been the employer listed on the wage statements and employment records issued to Plaintiff during the relevant time period that Plaintiff was employed with Defendants.

6. Defendant TURN AROUND COMMUNICATIONS, INC. is a California

1 corporation and is registered with the California Secretary of State. Defendant TURN AROUND
2 COMMUNICATIONS, INC. has been the employer listed employment records issued to Plaintiff
3 during the relevant time period that Plaintiff was employed with Defendants.

4 7. Defendant PEOPLEASE, LLC is a South Carolina limited liability company and is
5 registered with the California Secretary of State. Defendant PEOPLEASE, LLC has been the
6 employer listed employment records issued to Plaintiff during the relevant time period that
7 Plaintiff was employed with Defendants.

8 8. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
9 whatever else, of the Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are currently
10 unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of
11 Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
12 designated herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, are legally responsible in
13 some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend
14 this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated herein as
15 Does 1 through 50 when their identities become known.

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

25 10. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act by a
26 defendant or defendants, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to mean the acts and
27 failures to act of each defendant acting individually, jointly, and severally.

28 11. Whenever and wherever reference is made to individuals who are not named as a

1 Defendant in this Complaint but were agents, servants, employees and/or supervisors of
2 Defendants, such individuals at all relevant times acted on behalf of Defendants within the scope
3 of their employment.

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 12. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
6 Procedure § 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code § 17203. This Action is brought
7 as a Class Action on behalf of similarly situated Class Members of Defendants pursuant to
8 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. Venue as to Defendants is also proper in this judicial
9 district pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395 *et seq.* Upon information and belief,
10 the obligations and liabilities giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in part in Los Angeles County.
11 Defendants maintain and operate facilities in Los Angeles County and employs Plaintiff and other
12 Class Members in Los Angeles County, while doing business throughout California.

13 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

14 13. Class Members consistently worked at Defendants behest without being paid all
15 wages due. Plaintiff and Class Members were either not paid by Defendants for all hours worked
16 or otherwise were not paid at the appropriate minimum, regular and overtime rates based on the
17 number of assignments and the type of assignments Plaintiff and Class Members completed under
18 a piece rate calculation. Plaintiff was paid by piece-rate while he was employed by Defendants or
19 by some hybrid calculation combining the piece-rate with an hourly rate derived from Defendants'
20 policy without regard to the real-time hours worked by Plaintiff and Class Members in performing
21 tasks required of them by Defendants. Plaintiff also contends that Defendants, failed, to pay
22 Plaintiff and the Class Members all wages due and owing, including for non-productive time and
23 by requiring off the clock work, unlawfully rounding to their detriment, failing to provide meal
24 and rest breaks, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to timely pay wages including
25 final wages, failing to maintain accurate records, undercompensating for on-call time, and failing
26 to reimburse necessary business expenses all in violation of various provisions of the California
27 Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

28 14. During the course of Class Members' employment with Defendants, they were not

1 paid all wages they were owed despite being subject to Defendants control. Class Members were
2 paid by piece-rate or some hybrid calculation combined with an hourly rate derived from
3 Defendants' policy without regard to the real-time hours worked by Class Members in performing
4 tasks required of them by Defendants. Specifically, Class Members were not provided with
5 minimum wages for all their non-productive work time, including for time during which pieces
6 were not being generated, time spent waiting for assignments, and Defendants also failed to pay
7 for non-productive rest break time as is required for employees paid on a piece rate basis.

8 15. Defendants also failed to pay Class Members all wages due and owing because
9 Defendants failed to pay on-call or standby pay. Specifically, Defendants would contact Plaintiff
10 and inform him that he needs to immediately report to work. However, he was not paid on-call or
11 standby pay. Upon information and belief, Class Members were also required to be on-call and
12 were not compensated for on-call or standby pay.

13 16. Moreover, Defendants failed to maintain a timekeeping system that records clock
14 in and clock out times to the real minute. Defendants had a consistent policy and practice of
15 unlawfully rounding hours worked to the detriment of the Class Members. Rather than paying
16 Class Members for all hours and minutes they actually worked, Defendants followed a uniform
17 policy and practice of rounding all time entries to the nearest quarter-hour or half-hour (i.e. to the
18 nearest 15-minute or 30-minute time increment), and generally did so to the detriment of the Class
19 Members, and Plaintiff contend this policy is not neutral and resulted, over time, to the detriment
20 of the Class Members by systematically under-compensating them. Rather than reflecting the
21 actual hours worked by Class Members, the time entries were rounded and reduced to reflect the
22 scheduled work time rather than the actual hours worked. These unlawfully rounded time entries
23 were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks
24 were created.

25 17. By implementing policies, programs, practices, procedures and protocols which
26 resulted in off the clock work and also rounded the hours worked by Class Members down to their
27 detriment and systematically failed to pay for all hours worked, Defendants' willful actions
28 resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages to Class Members, including underpayment of

1 overtime pay to Class Members over the relevant time period. For example, the above described
2 off the clock work addressed above caused Plaintiff to begin receiving overtime pay later than
3 they should have.

4 18. As a result of the above described requirements to work off the clock, unlawful
5 rounding by Defendants and the other wage violations they endured at Defendants' hands, Class
6 Members were not properly paid all wages earned and all wages owed to them by Defendants,
7 including when working more than eight (8) hours in any given day and/or more than forty (40)
8 hours in any given week.

9 19. As a result of Defendants' unlawful policies and practices, Class Members incurred
10 overtime hours worked for which they were not adequately and completely compensated, in
11 addition to the hours they were required to work off the clock. To the extent applicable,
12 Defendants also failed to pay Class Members at an overtime rate of 1.5 times the regular rate for
13 the first eight hours of the seventh consecutive work day in a week and overtime payments at the
14 rate of 2 times the regular rate for hours worked over eight (8) on the seventh consecutive work
15 day, as required under the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders.

16 20. Therefore, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
17 continuing to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Class
18 Members for all hours worked, and failing to pay minimum wages for all time worked, as required
19 by California law. Defendants thus failed to pay Class Members at least minimum wages for all
20 the time they worked for Defendants in violation of the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage
21 Orders as the actual times when Class Members were under the control and direction of
22 Defendants was under reported in the hours reflected on the timekeeping records. Furthermore,
23 Defendants' willful actions resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages to Class Members,
24 including underpayment of overtime pay to Class Members over a period of time.

25 21. Therefore, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
26 continuing to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Class
27 Members for all hours worked. Also, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit
28 and continuing to the present, Defendants also had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay

1 Class Members their true and correct overtime compensation at premium overtime rates for all
2 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, and double-time
3 rates for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours a day, in violation of Labor Code § 510
4 and the corresponding sections of IWC Wage Orders.

5 22. Additionally, Defendants failed to provide all the legally required unpaid, off-duty
6 meal periods and all the legally required paid, off-duty rest periods to Class Members, as required
7 by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. Class Members were required to perform work as
8 ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during a shift but were often required to do so
9 without receiving a lawful and timely meal break. In addition to untimely meal periods,
10 Defendants also required Class Members to respond to work demands. Defendants placed their
11 needs over Class Members lawful meal and rest breaks and this resulted in Class Members often
12 having to work through their scheduled meal and/or rest breaks, or otherwise taking shortened
13 ones, because the demands of the job would not avail them the opportunity to take a lawfully
14 uninterrupted and off duty meal and/or rest break.

15 23. On the occasions when Class Members worked over 10 hours in a shift, Defendants
16 also failed to provide them with a second, uninterrupted, timely and duty-free meal period. As a
17 result, Defendants' failure to provide Class Members with all legally required off-duty, unpaid
18 meal periods and all the legally required off-duty, paid rest periods is and will be evidenced by
19 Defendants' business records, or lack thereof. Defendants also failed to pay Class Members
20 "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Class Member's effective hourly rate of pay, for
21 each meal period or rest break that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

22 24. Therefore, for at least four years prior to the filing of this action and through to the
23 present, Defendants have regularly required Class Members to work shifts in excess of five (5)
24 hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes,
25 and shifts in excess of (10) hours without providing them with second meal periods of not less
26 than thirty minutes; nor did Defendants pay Class Members "premium pay," i.e. one hour of
27 wages at each Class Member's effective hourly rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants
28 failed to provide or deficiently provided.

1 25. Meal period violations thus occurred in one or more of the following manners:

- 2 (a) Class Members were not provided full thirty-minute duty free meal periods
3 for work days in excess of five (5) hours and were not compensated one (1)
4 hour's wages in lieu thereof, all in violation of, among others, Labor Code
5 §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
6 Order(s);
- 7 (b) Class Members were not provided second full thirty-minute duty free meal
8 periods for work days in excess of ten (10) hours;
- 9 (c) Class Members were required to work through at least part of their daily
10 meal period(s);
- 11 (d) Meal periods were provided after five (5) hours of continuous work during
12 a shift; and
- 13 (e) Class Members were restricted in their ability to take a full thirty-minute
14 meal period.

15 26. Class Members were also not authorized and permitted to take lawful rest periods,
16 were systematically required by Defendants to work through or during breaks and were not
17 provided with one (1) hour's wages in lieu thereof. Class Members were restricted in their ability
18 to take their full ten (10) minutes net rest time or were otherwise not provided with duty-free rest
19 periods. Therefore, from at least four years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
20 present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Class Members with paid rest breaks of not
21 less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours; or major fraction
22 thereof, nor did Defendant pay Class Members premium pay for each day on which requisite rest
23 breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided.

24 27. Rest period violations therefore arose in one or more of the following manners:

- 25 (a) Class Members were required to work without being provided a minimum
26 ten (10) minute rest period for every four (4) hours or major fraction
27 thereof worked and were not compensated one (1) hour of pay at their
28 regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not

provided;

(b) Class Members were not authorized and permitted to take timely rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof; and

(c) Class Members were required to remain on-duty during rest periods or otherwise had their rest periods interrupted by work demands.

28. Defendants also consistently failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226(a). Specifically, the wage statements Defendants provided Class members failed to list the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate during the pay period. Thus, the wage statements are in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(3). Moreover, the wage statements given to Class Members failed to accurately account for unpaid wages and overtime because Defendants had unlawfully rounded time entries to the detriment of the Class Members and their actual hours worked were under-reported due to off the clock work.

29. Additionally, the wage statements given to Class Members failed to accurately account for premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks.

30. From at least four (4) years prior to filing this lawsuit and continuing to the present, Defendants have thus also had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages owed to Class Members at the time of their termination of within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as required by California wage-and-hour laws. Specifically, Class Members were not paid all regular and overtime wages because Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked by requiring off the clock work and unlawfully rounding time entries to the detriment of Class Members. Additionally, Defendants failed to pay premium wages owed for unprovided meal periods and rest periods, as further detailed in this Complaint. Defendants' failure to pay said wages within the required time was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

31. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the present, Defendants have regularly required Plaintiff to incur business expenses in the course of performing his required job duties for Defendants including for mileage, cell phone expenses, protective gear, and hand tools. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff to use his personal cell phone for work-related purposes throughout his shift by using a specialized

1 application, taking work photos, and communicating with co-workers and supervisors. Moreover,
2 Defendants required Class Members to wear protective gear such as steel toe boots, reflective
3 gear, and hard hats. Defendants did not reimburse Class Members for the protective gear and
4 failed to pay for protective gear maintenance. Upon information and belief, Class Members
5 incurred similar costs. These expenses incurred by Plaintiff and Class Members were necessary
6 and required of them in performing their assigned job duties, but Defendants failed to reimburse
7 Plaintiff and Class Members for all such necessary expenditures, thus entitling them to
8 reimbursement according to proof as required under Labor Code § 2802 and the applicable
9 provisions of the IWC Wage Orders.

10 32. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff and Class Members bring this action pursuant to,
11 *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174,
12 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2802, and 2698 *et seq.*, and California
13 Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11000 *et seq.*

14 33. Furthermore, pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-17208, Plaintiff
15 and the Class Members seek injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of all benefits
16 Defendants have enjoyed from their violations of Labor Code and the other unfair, unlawful, or
17 fraudulent practices alleged in this Complaint.

18 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

19 34. Plaintiff seeks to represent the Subclasses composed of and defined as follows:

20 a. Subclass 1. Minimum Wages Subclass. All Class Members who were not
21 compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the applicable minimum wage.

22 b. Subclass 2. Wages and Overtime Subclass. All Class Members who were not
23 compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the required rates of pay, including for all
24 hours worked in excess of eight in a day and/or forty in a week.

25 c. Subclass 3. Meal Period Subclass. All Class Members who were subject to
26 Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to provide unpaid 30-minute uninterrupted and duty-
27 free meal periods or one hour of pay at the Class Member's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

28 d. Subclass 4. Rest Break Subclass. All Class Members who were subject to

Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to authorize and permit Class Members to take uninterrupted, duty-free, 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof, and failing to pay one hour of pay at the Class Member's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

e. Subclass 5. Wage Statement Subclass. All Class Members who, within the applicable limitations period, were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

f. Subclass 6. Termination Pay Subclass. All Class Members who, within the applicable limitations period, either voluntarily or involuntarily separated from their employment and were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to timely pay wages upon termination.

g. Subclass 7: Failure to Timely Pay Wages Twice Monthly Subclass. All Class Members who were subject to Defendants' policy and practice of not timely paying all wages earned when they were due and payable at least twice monthly.

h. Subclass 8. Payroll Records Subclass. All Class members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to keep accurate time and wage records as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

i. Subclass 9. Expense Reimbursement Subclass. All Class Members who incurred necessary and reasonable expenses in connection with performing their job duties for Defendant and who were subject to a policy and/or practice under which such expenses were not reimbursed.

j. Subclass 10. UCL Subclass. All Class Members who are owed restitution as a result of Defendants' business acts and practices, to the extent such acts and practices are found to be unlawful, deceptive, and/or unfair.

35. Plaintiff reserves the right under California Rule of Court 3.765 to amend or modify the class description with greater particularity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the Class against Defendants, the Class Period should be adjusted accordingly.

36. Defendants, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order requirements,

1 and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and willfully, engaged
2 in a practice whereby Defendants failed to correctly calculate compensation for the time worked
3 by Class Members, even though Defendants enjoyed the benefit of this work, required Class
4 Members to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work. Defendants have
5 uniformly denied these Class Members wages to which these employees are entitled and failed to
6 provide meal periods or authorize and permit rest periods, in order to unfairly cheat the
7 competition and unlawfully profit.

8 37. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
9 under the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community
10 of interest in litigation and proposed class is easily ascertainable.

11 **A. Numerosity**

12 38. The potential members of the class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all
13 the member of the class is impracticable. While the precise number of class member has not been
14 determined at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants employ or, during the
15 time period relevant to this lawsuit, hundreds of employees who satisfy the Class definition within
16 the State of California.

17 39. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant time period increases this
18 number substantially. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' employment records will provide
19 information as to the number and location of all Class Members.

20 **B. Commonality**

21 40. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class that predominates over
22 any questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common questions of law and fact
23 include:

- 24 a. Whether Defendants failed to pay Class Members minimum wages;
- 25 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay Class Members wages for all hours worked and
26 all pieces earned;
- 27 c. Whether Defendants paid Class Members for all nonproductive time worked,
28 including non-productive time during which pieces were not being generated and

- the nonproductive rest period time for which Class Members were not paid;
- c. Whether Defendants failed to pay Class Members overtime as required under Labor Code § 510;
- d. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, by failing to provide Class Members with requisite meal periods or premium pay in lieu thereof;
- e. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, by failing to authorize and permit Class Members to take requisite rest breaks or provide premium pay in lieu thereof;
- f. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226(a) by providing Class Members with inaccurate wage statements;
- g. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by failing to pay wages and compensation due and owing at the time of termination of employment;
- h. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful;
- i. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226 and § 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of Class Members' earned wages and work periods;
- j. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 1194 by failing to compensate all Class Members during the relevant time period for all hours worked, whether regular or overtime;
- k. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 204 by failing to timely pay wages;
- l. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses Defendants required them to incur in performing their job duties;
- m. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 by failing to produce employment records and pay records;
- n. Whether Defendants violated Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; and
- o. Whether Class Members are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to Business and

Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

C. Typicality

41. The claims of the named plaintiff is typical of those of Class Members. The Class Members all sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of statutes, as well as regulations that have the force and effect of law, as alleged herein.

D. Adequacy of Representation

42. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of the Class Members. Counsel who represents Class Members are experienced and competent in litigating employment class actions.

E. Superiority of Class Action

43. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Class Members is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to all Class Members predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. Each Class Member has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies or practices of failing to compensate Class Members properly.

44. As to the issues raised in this case, a class action is superior to all other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, as joinder of all Class Members is impracticable and many legal and factual questions to be adjudicated apply uniformly to all Class Members. Further, as the economic or other loss suffered by vast numbers of Class Members may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual actions makes it difficult for the Class Members to individually redress the wrongs they have suffered. Moreover, in the event disgorgement is ordered, a class action is the only mechanism that will permit the employment of a fluid fund recovery to ensure that equity is achieved. There will be relatively little difficulty in managing this case as a class action, and proceeding on a class-wide basis will permit Class Members to vindicate their rights for violations they endured which they would otherwise be foreclosed from receiving in a multiplicity of individual lawsuits that would be cost prohibitive to

1 them.

2 45. Class action treatment will allow those persons similarly situated to litigate their
3 claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.
4 Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties in managing this case that should preclude class treatment.
5 Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed Class Members that would
6 set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own business records can be
7 utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent
8 that any further notice is required additional media and/or mailings can be used.

9 46. Defendants, as prospective and actual employers of the Class Members, had a
10 special fiduciary duty to disclose to prospective Class Members the true facts surrounding
11 Defendants' pay practices, policies and working conditions imposed upon Class Members as well
12 as the effect of any alleged arbitration agreements that may have been forced upon them. In
13 addition, Defendants knew they possessed special knowledge about pay practices and policies,
14 most notably intentionally refusing to pay for all hours actually worked which should have been
15 recorded in Defendants' pay records and the consequence of the alleged arbitration agreements
16 and policies and practices on Class Members.

17 47. Class Members did not discover the fact that they were entitled to all pay under the
18 Labor Code until shortly before the filing of this lawsuit nor was there ever any discussion about
19 Plaintiff's and the Class' waiver of their Constitutional rights of trial by jury, right to collectively
20 organize and oppose unlawful pay practices under California law as well as obtain injunctive relief
21 preventing such practices from continuing. As a result, the applicable statutes of limitation were
22 tolled until such time as Plaintiff and the Class Members discovered their claims.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

25 **(Against All Defendants)**

26 48. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
27 full herein.

28 49. Defendants failed to pay Class Members minimum wages for all hours worked or

1 all pieces earned. Class Members were not provided with minimum wages for all their non-
2 productive work time, including for time during which pieces were not being generated, time spent
3 waiting for assignments, and Defendants also failed to pay for non-productive rest break time as is
4 required for employees paid on a piece rate basis. Class Members would work hours and not
5 receive wages, including as alleged above in connection with off the clock work and unlawful
6 rounding of hours. Defendants, and each of them, have intentionally and improperly changed,
7 adjusted and/or modified the hours of Class Members, which resulted in off the clock work and
8 underpayment of all wages owed to Class Members over a period of time, while benefiting
9 Defendants. During the relevant time period, Defendants thus regularly failed to pay minimum
10 wages to Class Members, to their detriment. Additionally, Defendants had a consistent policy of
11 failing to pay Class Members for hours worked during alleged meal and rest periods for which
12 Class Members were consistently denied, as also addressed herein. Defendants' uniform pattern of
13 unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the Class as a
14 whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate
15 compensation to Class Members as to minimum wage pay.

16 50. In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum
17 wage for all hours worked. (IWC Wage Order MW-2014). Additionally, pursuant to California
18 Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must
19 timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

20 51. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states:
21 "The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to
22 employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful."

23 52. The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the
24 relevant period is found in Paragraph 4(A)-4(D) of the IWC Wage Orders.

25 53. The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private
26 civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: "Notwithstanding any agreement to
27 work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
28 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the

1 unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including
2 interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit."

3 54. As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages
4 incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also,
5 California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
6 Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for
7 all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate and no part of this rate may
8 be used as a credit against a minimum wage obligation.

9 55. Additionally, California Labor Code § 226.2(a)(1) states that, for "employees
10 compensated on a piece-rate basis during a pay period, . . . Employees shall be compensated for
11 rest and recovery periods and all other nonproductive time separate from any piece-rate
12 compensation." Defendants failed to do so for Plaintiff and the Class Members when they were
13 paid on a piece rate basis, including by failing to comply with the other provisions of Labor Code
14 § 226.2 addressing the requirements for compensating employees for rest and recovery periods
15 and other non-productive time separate from piece rate compensation. Employees were paid on a
16 piece rate basis. However, Defendants failed to separately pay Employees for their rest periods, at
17 least for the majority of the Class period, in violation of Labor Code § 226.2 and California
18 minimum wage laws, discussed above.

19 56. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, Defendants
20 inaccurately recorded, or required Class Members to input times that did not reflect their actual
21 hours worked, or calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
22 worked by Class Members. Defendants acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all
23 earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare
24 Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations. As a result of these
25 violations, Defendant also failed to timely pay all wages earned in accordance with California
26 Labor Code § 1194.

27 57. California Labor Code § 1194.2 also provides for the following remedies: "In any
28 action under Section 1194 . . . to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the

1 minimum wages fixed by an order of the commission, an employee shall be entitled to recover
2 liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.”

3 58. In addition to restitution for all unpaid wages, pursuant to California Labor Code §
4 1197.1, Class Members are entitled to recover a penalty of \$100.00 for the initial failure to timely
5 pay each employee minimum wages, and \$250.00 for each subsequent failure to pay each
6 employee minimum wages.

7 59. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Class Members are further entitled to
8 recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

9 60. Defendants have the ability to pay minimum wages for all time worked and have
10 willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this
11 indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Class Members.

12 61. Wherefore, Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages
13 (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum
14 wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit pursuant
15 to California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiff and the other members of the Class further request
16 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
17 assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California
18 Labor Code, including § 558, and/or other applicable statutes.

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES AND OVERTIME UNDER LABOR CODE § 510**

21 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

24 63. California Labor Code § 1194 provides that “any employee receiving less than the
25 legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to
26 recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime
27 compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees, and costs of suit.” The action
28 may be maintained directly against the employer in an employee’s name without first filing a

1 claim with the Division of Labor Standards and Enforcement.

2 64. By their conduct, as set forth herein, Defendants violated California Labor Code §
3 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Class
4 Members: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight (8)
5 hours in a workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any workweek or for the first eight (8) hours
6 worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for
7 hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any one (1) day or for hours worked in excess of
8 eight (8) hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek.

9 65. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Class Members wages for all
10 hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work and by unlawfully rounding down actual
11 hours worked as addressed above. Defendants, and each of them, have intentionally and
12 improperly rounded, changed, adjusted and/or modified certain employees' hours, including
13 Plaintiff's, in order to avoid paying Class Members all earned and owed straight time and
14 overtime wages and other benefits, in violation of the California Labor Code, the California Code
15 of Regulations and the IWC Wage Orders and guidelines set forth by the Division of Labor
16 Standards and Enforcement. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring Class
17 Members to work through portions of their meal period. Therefore, Class Members were not
18 properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours
19 in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Based on information and belief, Defendants
20 did not make available to Class Members a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when
21 Class Members worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants
22 unlawfully rounded to the Class Members' detriment.

23 66. Defendants' failure to pay Class Members the unpaid balance of regular wages
24 owed and overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of Labor
25 Code §§ 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

26 67. Additionally, Labor Code § 558(a) provides "any employer or other person acting
27 on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any
28 provisions regulating hours and days of work in any order of the IWC shall be subject to a civil

1 penalty as follows: (1) For any violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each
2 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover
3 underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
4 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an
5 amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall
6 be paid to the affected employee.” Labor Code § 558(c) states, “the civil penalties provided for in
7 this section are in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty provided by law.” Defendants
8 have violated provisions of the Labor Code regulating hours and days of work as well as the IWC
9 Wage Orders. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class Members seek the remedies set forth in Labor
10 Code § 558.

11 68. Defendants’ failure to pay compensation in a timely fashion also constituted a
12 violation of California Labor Code § 204, which requires that all wages shall be paid
13 semimonthly. From four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit to the present, in direct
14 violation of that provision of the California Labor Code, Defendants have failed to pay all wages
15 and overtime compensation earned by Class Members. Each such failure to make a timely
16 payment of compensation to Class Members constitutes a separate violation of California Labor
17 Code § 204.

18 69. Class Members have been damaged by these violations of California Labor Code
19 §§ 204 and 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission).

20 70. Consequently, pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§
21 204, 510, 558, and 1194, and the applicable IWC Wage Order, paragraph 3(A) and 4(B),
22 Defendants are liable to Class Members for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime
23 compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, as well as the
24 assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional
25 sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **MEAL-PERIOD LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

6 72. Class Members regularly worked shifts greater than five (5) hours and in some
7 instances, greater than ten (10) hours. Pursuant to Labor Code § 512 an employer may not employ
8 someone for a shift of more than five (5) hours without providing him or her with a meal period of
9 not less than thirty (30) minutes or for a shift of more than ten (10) hours without providing him or
10 her with a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

11 73. Defendants failed to provide Class Members with meal periods as required under
12 the Labor Code. Defendants placed their needs over Class Members lawful meal breaks and this
13 resulted in Class Members consistently having to work through their scheduled meal breaks
14 because the demands of the job would not avail them the opportunity to take a lawfully
15 uninterrupted and off-duty meal break. Furthermore, upon information and belief, on the occasions
16 when Class Members worked more than ten (10) hours in a given shift, they did so without
17 receiving a second uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period as required by law.

18 74. Defendants thus failed to provide Class Members with meal periods as required by
19 the Labor Code, including by not providing them with the opportunity to take meal breaks, by
20 providing them late or for less than thirty (30) minutes, or by requiring them to perform work
21 during breaks.

22 75. Moreover, Defendants failed to compensate Class Members for each meal period
23 not provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraph 11 of
24 the applicable IWC Wage Orders, which provide that, if an employer fails to provide an employee
25 a meal period in accordance with this section, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of
26 pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not
27 provided. Defendants failed to compensate Class Members for each meal period not provided or
28 inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7.

1 76. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order,
2 paragraph 11, Class Members are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages
3 at their effective hourly rates of pay for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, a
4 sum to be proven at trial, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the
5 Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and other statutes.

6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **REST-BREAK LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

8 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

11 78. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and paragraph 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders
12 provide that employers must authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods at the rate of
13 ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) work hours.

14 79. Class Members consistently worked consecutive four (4) hour shifts and were
15 generally scheduled for shifts of greater than 3.5 hours total, thus requiring Defendants to
16 authorize and permit them to take rest periods. Pursuant to the Labor Code and the applicable IWC
17 Wage Order, Class Members were entitled to paid rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes for
18 each consecutive four (4) hour shift, and Defendants failed to provide Class Members with timely
19 rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes for each consecutive four (4) hour shift. Defendants
20 placed their needs over Class Members lawful rest breaks and this resulted in Class Members
21 consistently having to work through their scheduled rest breaks because the demands of the job
22 would not avail them the opportunity to take a lawfully uninterrupted and off-duty rest break.
23 Thus, Class Members were consistently denied of their rest breaks.

24 80. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and paragraph 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders
25 provide that if an employer fails to provide an employee rest period in accordance with this
26 section, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
27 compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

28 81. Defendants, and each of them, have therefore intentionally and improperly denied

rest periods to Class Members in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and paragraph 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

82. Defendants failed to authorize and permit Class Members to take rest periods, as required by the Labor Code. Moreover, Defendants did not compensate Class Members with an additional hour of pay at each Class Member's effective hourly rate for each day that Defendants failed to provide them with adequate rest breaks, as required under Labor Code § 226.7.

83. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraph 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Class Members are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at their effective hourly rates of pay for each day worked without the required rest breaks, a sum to be proven at trial, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226(a)
(Against All Defendants)

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

85. California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate, itemized statement in writing showing the gross and net earnings, total hours worked, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; these statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid.

86. Defendants failed to provide Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, the wage statements Defendants provided Class members failed to list the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate during the pay period. Thus, the wage statements are in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(3). Moreover, the wage statements given to Class Members failed to accurately

1 account for unpaid wages and overtime because Defendants had unlawfully rounded time entries
2 to the detriment of the Class Members and their actual hours worked were under-reported due to
3 off the clock work.

4 87. Throughout the liability period, Defendants intentionally failed to furnish to Class
5 Members, upon each payment of wages, itemized statements accurately showing: (1) gross wages
6 earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any
7 applicable piece rate paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the
8 inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and
9 only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number
10 other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the
11 employer and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
12 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee pursuant to Labor Code § 226,
13 amongst other statutory requirements. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide
14 Class Members with such timely and accurate wage and hour statements.

15 88. Class Members suffered injury as a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional
16 failure to provide them with the accurate wage and hour statements as required by law and are
17 presumed to have suffered injury and be entitled to penalties under Labor Code § 226(e), as the
18 Defendants have failed to provide wage statements with accurate and complete information as
19 required by any one or more of items Labor Code § 226 (a)(1) to (9), inclusive, and Class
20 Members cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone one or more of the
21 following: (i) The amount of the gross wages or net wages paid to the employee during the pay
22 period or any of the other information required to be provided on the itemized wage statement
23 pursuant to items (2) to (4), inclusive, (6), and (9) of subdivision (a), (ii) Which deductions the
24 employer made from gross wages to determine the net wages paid to the employee during the pay
25 period, (iii) The name and address of the employer and, (iv) The name of the employee and only
26 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other
27 than a social security number. For purposes of Labor Code § 226(e) "promptly and easily
28 determine" means a reasonable person [i.e. an objective standard] would be able to readily

ascertain the information without reference to other documents or information.

89. Therefore, as a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Class Members suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

90. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and 1174, and the applicable IWC Wage Order, paragraph 7(B), Class Members are entitled to recover 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) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 203
(Against All Defendants)

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

92. Numerous Class Members are no longer employed by Defendants; they either quit Defendants' employ or were fired therefrom.

93. Defendants failed to pay these Class Members all wages due and certain at the time of termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation.

94. The wages withheld from these Class Members by Defendants remained due and owing for more than thirty (30) days from the date of separation from employment.

95. Defendants failed to pay Class Members without abatement, all wages as defined by applicable California law. Specifically, Class Members were not paid all regular and overtime wages because Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked by requiring off the clock work and unlawfully rounding time entries to the detriment of Class Members. Additionally, Defendants failed to pay premium wages owed for unprovided meal periods and rest periods, as further

1 detailed in this Complaint. Defendants' failure to pay said wages within the required time was
2 willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

3 96. Defendants' failure to pay wages, as alleged entitles these Class Members to
4 penalties under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until
5 paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

6 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
7 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 204**
8 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

11 98. Labor Code § 204 instructs that: "All wages, ...earned by any person in any
12 employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in
13 advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days,
14 inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month
15 during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day,
16 inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following
17 month." Additionally, the requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of
18 wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven
19 calendar days following the close of the payroll period." As detailed above, Defendants
20 maintained a consistently applied policy and practice of not paying all wages earned between the
21 1st and 15th days of a month between the 16th and 26th day and failed to pay all wages earned
22 between the 16th and the last day of the month between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.
23 Defendants similarly failed to pay all wages earned by not more than seven calendar days
24 following the close of the payroll period. These failures all arose from either Defendants' failure to
25 pay for all hours worked or failure to pay all earned commission wages.

26 99. All wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Class Members, including as required
27 under Labor Code § 510, were therefore not timely paid by Defendants, as addressed in detail
28 above. Additionally, wages required by Labor Code § 1194 and other sections became due and

1 payable to each Class Member in each pay period that he or she was not provided with a meal
2 period or rest period or paid straight or overtime wages or commissions to which he or she was
3 entitled.

4 100. Defendants thus violated Labor Code § 204 by systematically refusing to
5 pay wages due under the Labor Code, as addressed above. Additionally, under paragraph 4(B) of
6 the applicable IWC Wage Orders, employers are required “to pay each employee, on the
7 established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all
8 hours worked in the payroll period, ...” Under Labor Code § 1198, “[t]he employment of any
9 employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by
10 the order is unlawful.” Plaintiff and the Class Members may therefore pursue damages and
11 penalties for violations of Labor Code § 204 and paragraph 4(B) of the applicable IWC Wage
12 Orders, including penalties under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

13 101. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and Class Members
14 seek to represent they have been deprived of wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and they
15 are entitled to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys’ fees, and
16 costs, pursuant to Labor Code § 210, 218.5, 1194 and 1198, and paragraphs 4(B) and 20 of the
17 applicable IWC Wage Orders.

18 EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

19 FAILURE TO KEEP REQUIRED PAYROLL RECORDS UNDER LABOR CODE § 1174 20 AND 1174.5

21 (Against All Defendants)

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

24 103. California Labor Code § 1174 requires that all employers shall keep
25 accurate time and wage records for all employees. California Labor Code § 1174.5 further requires
26 that any employee suffering injury due to a willful violation of the aforementioned obligations
27 may seek damages, including civil penalties, from the employer.

28 104. During the course of Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ employment,

Defendants consistently failed to maintain accurate time and wage records for Plaintiff and Class Members as required by California Labor Code § 1174 by failing to pay Plaintiff and Class Members proper wages, overtime, and premium pay as discussed above. Moreover, Defendants would routinely falsify Plaintiff's time records so that the time data indicated on the pay stubs never accurately reflected Plaintiff's work hours.

105. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for civil penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code § 1174.5 for the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REIMBURSEMENT OF NECESSARY EXPENDITURES UNDER LABOR CODE § 2802

(Against All Defendants)

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

107. Under Labor Code § 2802(a) an employer must indemnify its employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

108. Defendants have regularly required Plaintiff to incur business expenses in the course of performing his required job duties for Defendants including for mileage, cell phone expenses, protective gear, and hand tools. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff to use his personal cell phone for work-related purposes throughout his shift by using a specialized application, taking work photos, and communicating with co-workers and supervisors. Moreover, Defendants required Class Members to wear protective gear such as steel toe boots, reflective gear, and hard hats. Defendants did not reimburse Class Members for the protective gear and failed to pay for protective gear maintenance. Upon information and belief, Class Members incurred similar costs. These expenses incurred by Plaintiff and Class Members were necessary and required of them in performing their assigned job duties, but Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for all such necessary expenditures, thus entitling them to reimbursement according to proof as required under Labor Code § 2802 and the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9.

1 109. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Class Members have been
2 deprived of reimbursement in amounts to be determined at trial; they are entitled to recovery of
3 such amounts, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs.

4 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO PRODUCE REQUESTED RECORDS, LABOR CODE §§ 226 and 1198**

6 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

9 111. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, current and former employees
10 have the right to inspect or receive a copy of their records pertaining to their employment, upon
11 reasonable request to their employer. Under this statute, an employer that receives a request to
12 inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former employee must comply with
13 the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one calendar days from the date of the
14 request.

15 112. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5(a), every current and former
16 employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel
17 records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any grievance
18 concerning the employee. Under this statute, upon written request from a current or former
19 employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of those personnel
20 records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the current or former
21 employee, or his or her representative, not later than thirty calendar days from the date the
22 employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions. Failure to comply with
23 these requests allows for a civil penalty seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750), pursuant to Labor
24 Code §§ 1198.5(k) and 226(f).

25 113. On April 14, 2023, Plaintiff sent written requests through his counsel to
26 Defendants for their payroll records, timecards, and personnel records. However, Defendant has
27 yet to furnish any payroll or personnel records.

28 114. Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 by failing to

1 timely produce the required records requested by Plaintiff.

2 115. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with all
3 of his requested employment records is not an isolated incident, but was instead consistent with
4 Defendants' policy and practice that applied to Plaintiff and Employees.

5 116. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5, Plaintiff and Employees are
6 entitled to a penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750) from Defendants and attorneys' fees and
7 costs.

8 117. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(f), Plaintiff is entitled to a penalty
9 of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750) from Defendants and attorneys' fees and cost, and the other
10 Class members similarly situated are similarly entitled.

11 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
12 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 *ET SEQ.***
13 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

16 119. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, Class Members, and the general public,
17 brings this claim pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* The conduct of
18 Defendants as alleged in this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and
19 harmful to Class Members and the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights
20 affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

21 120. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code
22 § 17204, has suffered injury, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive
23 relief, restitution, and other appropriate equitable relief.

24 121. Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* prohibits unlawful and unfair
25 business practices. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants’ practices were deceptive and
26 fraudulent in that Defendants’ policy and practice failed to provide the required amount of
27 compensation for missed meal and rest breaks, and failed to adequately compensate Class
28 Members for all hours worked, due to systematic business practices as alleged herein that cannot

1 be justified, pursuant to the applicable California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission
2 requirements in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for
3 which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to California Business &
4 Professions Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

5 122. Wage-and-hour laws express fundamental public policies. Paying
6 employees their wages and overtime, providing them with meal periods and rest breaks, etc., are
7 fundamental public policies of California. Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of
8 this State vigorously to enforce minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not
9 required or permitted to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect law-
10 abiding employers and their employees from competitors who lower costs to themselves by failing
11 to comply with minimum labor standards.

12 123. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct
13 alleged in this Complaint Defendants have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated
14 specific provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business
15 practices in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; which conduct has deprived
16 Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, and all interested persons, of the rights, benefits, and
17 privileges guaranteed to all employees under the law.

18 124. Defendants' conduct, as alleged above, constitutes unfair competition in
19 violation of the Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

20 125. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, by failing to pay
21 wages and overtime, failing to provide meal periods and rest breaks, etc., either knew or in the
22 exercise of reasonable care should have known that their conduct was unlawful; therefore their
23 conduct violates the Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

24 126. By the conduct alleged herein, Defendants have engaged and continue to
25 engage in a business practice which violates California and federal law, including but not limited
26 to, the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations, and the California
27 Labor Code including Sections 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1198, for which this
28 Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to California Business &

1 Professions Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
2 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

3 127. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Class
4 Members have been damaged, in a sum to be proven at trial.

5 128. Unless restrained by this Court Defendants will continue to engage in such
6 unlawful conduct as alleged above. Pursuant to the Business & Professions Code, this Court
7 should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be
8 necessary to prevent the use by Defendants or their agents or employees of any unlawful or
9 deceptive practice prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, including but not limited to the
10 disgorgement of such profits as may be necessary to restore Class Members to the money
11 Defendants have unlawfully failed to pay.

12 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2698, *ET SEQ.***

14 **(Against All Defendants)**

15 129. Plaintiff realleges and incorporate all preceding paragraphs, as though set
16 forth in full herein.

17 130. Plaintiff and the Employees in the Class are also aggrieved employees as
18 defined under Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they suffered the violations alleged in this Complaint
19 and either were or are employed by the alleged violators, Defendants (“Aggrieved Employees”)
20 during the relevant time period.

21 131. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, not
22 providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and
23 failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above,
24 Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required
25 under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours
26 worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and
27 paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

28 132. As such, Employees seek wages and penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698

1 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code §
2 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, inter alia, on the following
3 California Labor Code sections: 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.2, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174,
4 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.1, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2698 *et seq.*

5 133. More specifically, after complying with the notice procedures of Labor
6 Code § 2699.3, Plaintiff asserts, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney
7 General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above
8 addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding
9 provisions, including as follows:

10 (a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all
11 earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime
12 premium wages for overtime hours worked under Labor Code §§ 226.2, 510, 1194(a), 1197, and
13 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking
14 all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, and wages, under Labor Code §§ 510,
15 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant
16 to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

17 (b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
18 Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to
19 take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under
20 Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC
21 Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under
22 paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,
23 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs
24 pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

25 (c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide
26 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to
27 maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226,
28 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking

1 all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e),
2 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order,
3 and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by
4 providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor
5 Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor
6 Code §226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a
7 penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial
8 citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent
9 citation, ...";

10 (d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at
11 least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204,
12 226.2, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable, and wages,
13 under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20
14 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code
15 § 2699(g)(1);

16 (e) Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to
17 reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
18 and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil
19 penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 221, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5,
20 and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs
21 pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

22 (f) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders and Other Labor Code
23 Sections: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage
24 Orders, each of which constitute separate violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code §
25 2699.5, and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and
26 paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to
27 Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

28 134. As also addressed above, Plaintiff, on behalf of the Aggrieved Employees,

1 also seek the penalties and remedies set forth in Labor Code § 558, which states:

2 (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or
3 causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work
4 in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1)
5 For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for
6 which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages.
7 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for
8 each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to
9 recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
10 employee.

11 (b) If upon inspection or investigation the Labor Commissioner determines that a
12 person had paid or caused to be paid a wage for overtime work in violation of any provision of this
13 chapter, or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare
14 Commission, the Labor Commissioner may issue a citation. The procedures for issuing, contesting,
15 and enforcing judgments for citations or civil penalties issued by the Labor Commissioner for a
16 violation of this chapter shall be the same as those set out in Section 1197.1.

17 (c) The civil penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other civil or
18 criminal penalty provided by law.

19 135. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies by sending a certified
20 letter to the LWDA and Defendants postmarked on **October 4, 2023**, addressing in detail the
21 specific provisions of the Labor Code Defendants have violated and addressing the facts and legal
22 theories to support the alleged violations and requested penalties. The LWDA has not provided
23 notice of its intent to investigate the alleged violations within 65 calendar days of the postmark
24 date of the letter, and Plaintiff adds this claim seeking penalties under the PAGA for the violations
25 addressed herein and in the PAGA Notice letter and the original Complaint.

26 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

27 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 28 1. For an order certifying this action as a class action;
2. For compensatory damages in the amount of the unpaid minimum wages for work
performed by Class Members and unpaid overtime compensation from at least four (4) years prior
to the filing of this action, as may be proven;
3. For liquidated damages in the amount equal to the unpaid minimum wage and
interest thereon, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, according to proof;
4. For compensatory damages in the amount of all unpaid wages, including overtime
and double-time pay, as may be proven;

5. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Class Members for each missed or deficient meal period where no premium pay was paid therefor from four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, as may be proven;
6. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Class Members for each day requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided where no premium pay was paid therefor from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, as may be proven;
7. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) for Class Members, as may be proven;
8. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for all Class Members who quit or were fired in an amount equal to their daily wage times thirty (30) days, as may be proven;
9. For restitution and/or damages for all amounts unlawfully withheld from the wages for all class members in violation of Labor Code § 204, as may be proven;
10. For restitution and/or damages for all amounts unlawfully withheld from the wages for all Class Members in violation of Labor Code § 2802, as may be proven;
11. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5, as may be proven;
12. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, including disgorgement or profits, as may be proven;
13. For an order enjoining Defendants and their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from acting in derogation of any rights or duties adumbrated in this Complaint;
14. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, as may be proven;
15. For other wages and penalties under the Labor Code as may be proven;
16. For all general, special, and incidental damages as may be proven;
17. For an award of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
18. For an award providing for the payment of the costs of this suit;
19. For an award of attorneys' fees; and
20. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper and just.

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

DATED: December 8, 2023

D.LAW, INC.

By: Natalie Har
David Yeremian
Natalie Haritounian
Attorneys for Plaintiff JORDAN MONTREL
HARDMAN, and all others similarly situated

- 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

DATED: December 8, 2023

By: Natalie Haritonian
David Yeremian
Natalie Haritonian
Attorneys for Plaintiff JORDAN MONTREL
HARDMAN, and all others similarly situated

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

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

Spencer W. Waldron
swaldron@fisherphillips.com
 Ryan W. Jebreil
jebreil@fisherphillips.com
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP
 2050 Main Street, Suite 1000
 Irvine, California 92614
 Telephone: (949) 851-2424
 Facsimile: (949) 851-0152
 Defendants for *PEOPLEASE, LLC*

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

[X] (STATE) I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.


Silvia Pimentel