

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

William C. Sung, SB# 280792

E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com

Tiffany L. Luu, SB# 335127

E-Mail: tluu@justiceforworkers.com

3600 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1815

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Tel: 323-922-2000

Fax: 323-922-2000

Attorneys for Plaintiff DOELISHA KELLY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

DOELISHA KELLY, an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

PAN AMERICAN PROPERTIES, INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through
50,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2023-01362739-CU-OE-CXC

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

- (1) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);
- (2) **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194,
1198);
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);
- (5) **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE § 226);
- (6) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);
- (7) **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE
NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES**
(LABOR CODE § 2802);
- (8) **FAILURE TO PAY CALL-BACK
PAY PREMIUMS (LABOR CODE §
1198, WAGE ORDER 5);**
- (9) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and**
- (10) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
CALIFORNIA PRIVATE**

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

**ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff DOELISHA KELLY (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants PAN AMERICAN PROPERTIES, INC., a California corporation, and DOES 1 to 50 inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1182.8, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 5-2001 (“Wage Order 5”), in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution. This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds \$25,000.

2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including Orange County, and some of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in Orange County. Furthermore, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within Orange County.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant herein was, an individual over the age of eighteen (18) and is a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or customs complained of herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1182.8, 1194, 1194.2,

1 1197, 1198, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and Wage Order 5.

2 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
3 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,
4 Defendants engaged in, and continue to engage in, business, and employed Plaintiff and other,
5 similarly-situated non-exempt employees within Orange County, and the State of California and,
6 therefore, were (and are) doing business in Orange County and the State of California.

7 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
8 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said
9 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
10 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed,
11 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
12 partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
13 and proximately caused Plaintiff, the Classes (as defined below), and Aggrieved Employees (as
14 defined below) to be subject to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages
15 complained of herein.

16 6. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
17 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,
18 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
19 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
20 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

21 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
22 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
23 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within
24 the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent
25 said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining
26 Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

27 8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were members of, and
28 engaged in, a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and

1 scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise.

2 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
3 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
4 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged.

5 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

6 10. Defendants own and operate a residential property management company in the State
7 of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt on-site apartment
8 manager from approximately January 21, 2023 to approximately November 2, 2023 in Long Beach,
9 California.

10 11. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants' timekeeping
11 and/or payroll policies and practices resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being
12 compensated for all hours actually worked. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees regularly
13 worked more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a workweek. Upon information and
14 belief, Defendants required Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to perform work before their
15 scheduled shifts, after their scheduled shifts, and/or during off-the-clock meal breaks, including
16 during evenings and weekends, and failed to compensate aggrieved employees for this time.
17 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not paid overtime compensation at the regular rate of
18 pay because Defendants failed to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary
19 remuneration, including the discounted value of their apartment units which they were required to
20 reside in as a condition of employment, into the regular rate of pay. As a result, Plaintiff and other
21 non-exempt employees were not compensated for all earned minimum and overtime wages.

22 12. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all
23 legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies/practices, which have
24 frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes),
25 and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and other non-exempt
26 employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work demands imposed
27 by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate records of Plaintiff's
28 and other non-exempt employees' hours worked, including accurate time records showing when

1 employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt
2 employees were not provided with all legally compliant meal periods to which they were entitled,
3 Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with the required meal
4 period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code
5 § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of
6 meal period premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7 in the event that a legally
7 compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees. Alternatively, Defendants
8 failed to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including the
9 discounted value of their apartment units which they were required to reside in as a condition of
10 employment, into the regular rate of compensation.

11 13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take
12 all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices, which failed to
13 authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction
14 thereof. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not able to take their legally compliant rest
15 breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. Additionally, although Plaintiff and other
16 non-exempt employees occasionally worked shifts in excess of 10 hours, Plaintiff and other non-
17 exempt employees were not authorized and permitted a third rest period during shifts in excess of
18 10 hours. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized
19 and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods to which they were entitled, Defendants
20 failed to compensate them with the required rest period premium(s) for each workday there was a
21 rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants
22 maintained no mechanism for the payment of rest period premium payments as required by Labor
23 Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally compliant rest period was not authorized and permitted to
24 their non-exempt employees.

25 14. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants violated Labor Code § 246 by
26 failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration into the paid
27 sick leave pay rate.

28 ///

1 15. Labor Code § 1198 provides: “The employment of any employee ... under conditions
2 of labor prohibited by the [Industrial Wage Orders] is unlawful.” Wage Order 5 requires that if an
3 employee is required to report for work a second time in any one workday and is furnished less than
4 two (2) hours of work on the second reporting, said employee shall be paid for two (2) hours at the
5 employee's regular rate of pay. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff
6 and other non-exempt employees for two (2) hours at the employee's regular rate of pay on days in
7 which Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees were on call afterhours and were required to
8 report for work a second time in one workday and were furnished less than two (2) hours of work
9 upon the second reporting.

10 16. Labor Code § 1182.8 provides: “An employer may charge a resident apartment
11 manager up to two-thirds of the apartment’s fair rental value, provided that: (1) there is a voluntary
12 written agreement, and (2) no credit for the apartment’s value is used to meet the employer’s
13 minimum wage obligations.” The applicable Industrial Wage Orders, including Wage Order 5-
14 2001, prohibits an employer from charging rent in excess of values enumerated in the Wage Orders.
15 Defendants violated the Wage Orders and Labor Code § 1182.8 by charging Plaintiff and other
16 aggrieved employees who were residential apartment managers over two-thirds of their apartment’s
17 fair rental value.

18 17. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, failure to
19 pay all meal and rest period premium wages, unlawful deductions by overcharging for rent, failure
20 to pay call-back pay premiums, and unlawful timekeeping and payroll practices as alleged above,
21 Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Plaintiff
22 and other non-exempt employees. As a further result of Defendants’ failure to pay all minimum and
23 overtime wages, sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to
24 timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and other former non-exempt employees upon their separation
25 of employment from Defendants.

26 18. Additionally, Defendants required Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to use
27 their personal cellphones. Despite requiring employees to incur these necessary business expenses,
28 Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for the cost of their

1 personal cellphones.

2 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

3 19. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and the
4 following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure:

- 5 a. Minimum Wage Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants
6 in the State of California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll
7 policies and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of
8 this action through the present.
- 9 b. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the
10 State of California who worked more than eight hours per day and/or 40 hours per
11 week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices, during
12 the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 13 c. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
14 the State of California who: (i) worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours;
15 and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours, during the four years
16 immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 17 d. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
18 the State of California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 or more hours, during the
19 four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 20 e. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants
21 in the State of California who received a wage statement, during the one year
22 immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.
- 23 f. Waiting Time Penalty Class: All of Defendants' formerly employed members of the
24 Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Rest Period Class, and/or Meal Period Class
25 during the three years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the
26 present.
- 27 g. Expense Reimbursement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of
28 Defendants in the State of California who were not reimbursed for all necessary

business expenses, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this action through the present.

- h. Callback Pay Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who were on call afterhours and were required to report for work a second time in one workday and were furnished less than two (2) hours of work upon the second reporting.

20. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number greater than 50 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

21. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of Interest**: There are predominant common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and members of the Classes, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:

- a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Overtime Class;
- b. Whether Defendants paid at least the minimum wage for all hours worked to members of the Minimum Wage Class;
- c. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period premium wages due to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- d. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Rest Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
- e. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226;

///

- 1 f. Whether Defendants reimbursed members of the Expense Reimbursement Class for
2 all necessary business expenses pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;
- 3 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay call-back pay premiums to Members of the Call-
4 Back Pay Class; and
- 5 h. Whether Defendants timely paid all final wages to members of the Waiting Time
6 Class at the time of their separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201
7 and 202.

8 These common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and
9 stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member. As
10 such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual
11 class member's showing as to their eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of their damages.

12 22. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because
13 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s)
14 of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein,
15 Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not paid all minimum and overtime wages owed due
16 to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies/practices, was not provided all required meal
17 periods, was not authorized and permitted all rest periods, did not receive premium pay for non-
18 compliant meal and rest periods, was not paid all final wages upon separation of employment, was
19 not provided with accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements, was no paid call-back pay
20 premiums, and was not reimbursed for all necessary business expenses.

21 23. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps
22 to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's
23 attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes
24 and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have litigated numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and
25 federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the
26 members of the Classes.

27 24. **Superiority:** The Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important
28 public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws

1 and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who
2 have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic
3 and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this
4 action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class
5 action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged
6 herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily
7 gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited
8 resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

9 25. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) to pursue an individual remedy
10 would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file
11 an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and
12 permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. The claims of the individual
13 members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution
14 considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending hereto.

15 26. Furthermore, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members,
16 even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
17 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish
18 potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with
19 respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest
20 of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or
21 impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. As such, the Classes identified
22 hereinabove are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

25 **(Against All Defendants)**

26 27. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
27 fully set forth herein.

28 ///

1 28. Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1197, and Wage Order 5, § 4 establish the right of
2 employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state or local law.
3 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal
4 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with
5 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
6 wages and interest accrued thereon. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform its
7 pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the
8 Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked, including, but not limited to, all hours they were
9 subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and
10 Wage Order 5.

11 29. Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under
12 conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code § 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an
13 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those
14 employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount
15 equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

16 30. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of minimum wages, Plaintiff and
17 members of the Minimum Wage Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid wages, including
18 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
19 218.6, 558, 1194, 1194.2, and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§ 3287 and
20 3289.

21 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
22 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
23 **(Against All Defendants)**

24 31. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
25 fully set forth herein.

26 32. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
27 Wage Order 5, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
28 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure

1 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

2 33. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
3 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours
4 worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 5. Wage Order 5, § 3 requires an employer
5 to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular rate of pay
6 for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of the Overtime
7 Class to work overtime hours but failed to compensate these employees for all overtime hours
8 actually worked.

9 34. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
10 members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime wages, including
11 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
12 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§
13 3287 and 3289.

14 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

16 **(Against All Defendants)**

17 35. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
18 fully set forth herein.

19 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
20 in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including
21 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods in
22 accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 5, § 11.

23 37. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to
24 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of compensation, in
25 accordance with California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

26 38. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiff and
27 members of the Meal Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for meal period
28 violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code

1 §§ 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 5, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

2 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

4 **(Against All Defendants)**

5 39. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
6 fully set forth herein.

7 40. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 5, § 12 and establish the right of
8 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period
9 worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
10 despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class
11 to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did not pay these individuals
12 an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to
13 authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

14 41. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
15 members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations
16 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees,
17 and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 5, and Civil Code §§
18 3287 and 3289.

19 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**

21 **(Against All Defendants)**

22 42. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
23 fully set forth herein.

24 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
25 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff
26 and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
27 that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of pay
28 and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the pay

1 period, and/or the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of
2 Labor Code § 226.

3 44. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class
4 with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led
5 to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages and meal and rest period
6 premium wages owed and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies
7 in Defendants' reported payroll data.

8 45. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful wage statement practices, Plaintiff and
9 members of the Wage Statement Class seek damages and/or statutory penalties, reasonable
10 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226.

11 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 46. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
15 fully set forth herein.

16 47. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an
17 employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of separation of employment in the event the
18 employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of their
19 intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit,
20 said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last
21 date of employment.

22 48. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
23 to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages due to them at their
24 separation from employment, including unpaid minimum and overtime wages as well as unpaid
25 meal and rest period and call-back pay premium wages.

26 49. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a
27 matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and members of
28 the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to

1 the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-202.

2 50. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor
3 Code § 203. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay Plaintiff and the members of the Waiting
4 Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in continued payment of
5 daily wages up to thirty days from the time the wages were due.

6 51. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the
7 Waiting Time Class seek statutory penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §
8 203.

9 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES**

11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 52. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
13 fully set forth herein.

14 53. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2802, which
15 states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or
16 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his
17 or obedience to the directions of the employer."

18 54. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and
19 members of the Expense Reimbursement Class all necessary business expenses they incurred in the
20 performance of their job duties.

21 55. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the
22 class seek recovery of unreimbursed business expenses, including interest thereon, reasonable
23 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802.

24 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO PAY CALL-BACK PAY PREMIUMS**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 56. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as
28 though fully set forth herein.

57. Labor Code § 1198 provides: “The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Industrial Wage Orders] is unlawful.” Wage Order 5 requires that if an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting, said employee shall be paid for two (2) hours at the employee's regular rate of pay.

58. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for two (2) hours at the employee's regular rate of pay on days in which Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees were on call afterhours and were required to report for work a second time in one workday and were furnished less than two (2) hours of work upon the second reporting.

59. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the class seek recovery of unpaid call-back pay premiums, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 1198 and Wage Order 5.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(Against All Defendants)

60. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

61. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by:

- a. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum wages due;
- b. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages due;
- c. failing to provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all meal period premium wages due;
- d. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class all rest periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all rest period premium

- 1 wages due;
- 2 e. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of
- 3 the Wage Statement Class;
- 4 f. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time
- 5 Penalty Class;
- 6 g. failing to pay call-back pay premiums to Plaintiff and members of the Call-Back Pay
- 7 Class; and
- 8 h. failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses to Plaintiff and members of the
- 9 Expense Reimbursement Class.

10 62. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived

11 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally

12 entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over

13 Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to

14 do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

15 63. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged

16 herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of

17 monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired

18 and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

19 64. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately

20 preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

21 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

23 **(Against All Defendants)**

24 65. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though

25 fully set forth herein.

26 66. Plaintiff, an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et*

27 *seq.*, acting on behalf of herself and other aggrieved employees (collectively, "Aggrieved

28 Employees"), brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due

1 to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant
2 to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial
3 violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or
4 intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each
5 employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and
6 \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3)
7 \$100 for each initial violation and \$250 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code §
8 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250 for each initial violation and \$1,000 for each
9 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to
10 Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as
11 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100 for each initial violation and
12 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor
13 Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code
14 violations:

- 15 a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Aggrieved Employees in
16 violation of Labor Code § 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- 17 b. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation
18 of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 19 c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period
20 premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in
21 violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;
- 22 d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay
23 rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of
24 compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;
- 25 e. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage
26 statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- 27 f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved
28 Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;

- g. Failing to pay call-back pay to Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code § 1198;
- h. Overcharging Aggrieved Employees who were employed as residential apartment managers for rent in violation of Labor Code §§ 1182.8 and 1198;
- i. Failure to reimburse Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802;
- j. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all paid sick leave wages in violation of Labor Code § 246;
- k. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and
- l. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

67. On or about November 17, 2023, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code identified in the preceding paragraph. Now that 33 days and 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, Defendants have not cured any curable violations, and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

68. Plaintiff has incurred attorneys’ fees and costs, which Plaintiff is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for herself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;

- 1 3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
- 2 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated
- 3 damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and
- 4 1197;
- 5 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties
- 6 according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- 7 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof
- 8 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
- 9 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof
- 10 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
- 11 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
- 12 226;
- 13 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
- 14 203;
- 15 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for unreimbursed business expenses according to
- 16 proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;
- 17 11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for unpaid call-back pay premiums according to
- 18 proof pursuant to Wage Order 5;
- 19 12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the
- 20 Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or
- 21 practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
- 22 *seq.*;
- 23 13. Upon the Tenth Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other Aggrieved
- 24 Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and
- 25 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to
- 26 pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation
- 27 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the
- 28 amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent

1 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial
2 violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee
3 per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation
4 pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code § 256, a
5 civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as waiting time under the
6 terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each
7 subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which
8 no civil penalty is specifically provided;

9 14. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6
10 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

11 15. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§
12 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

13 16. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

14 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims.

16
17 DATED: January 31, 2024

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

18
19 By: 

20 William C. Sung

21 Tiffany L. Luu

22 Attorneys for Plaintiff DOELISHA KELLY
23
24
25
26
27
28