

1 JAMIE K. SERB, ESQ. (SBN 289601)
jamie@crosnerlegal.com
2 BRANDON BROUILLETTE, ESQ. (SBN 273156)
bbrouillette@crosnerlegal.com
3 ZACHARY M. CROSNER, ESQ. (SBN 272295)
zach@crosnerlegal.com
4 **CROSNER LEGAL, PC**
5 9440 Santa Monica Blvd. Suite 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
6 Tel: (866) 276-7637
Fax: (310) 510-6429

7
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff JOHN MARTELL
on behalf of the State of California
9 and all Aggrieved Employees

Assigned for All Purposes
Judge Lon F. Hurwitz
Dept. CX103

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **COUNTY OF ORANGE**

12 JOHN MARTELL, on behalf of the State of
California and all Aggrieved Employees,

13 Plaintiff,

14
15 v.

16 H GREG AUTO BUENA PARK LLC, a
17 California Limited Liability Company; H
GREG AUTO MONROVIA LLC, a
18 California Limited Liability Company; H
GREG AUTO NEWPORT BEACH, LLC, a
19 California Limited Liability Company; H
GREG AUTO PUENTE HILLS LLC, a
20 California Limited Liability Company; and
DOES 1-100, inclusive,

21 Defendants.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No.: 30-2024-01375602-CU-OE-CXC

**PLAINTIFF'S REPRESENTATIVE
COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF
THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT, CAL. LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 2698, *et seq.***

1 Plaintiff, JOHN MARTELL, (“PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of the State of California and all
2 Aggrieved Employees (as defined below), hereby files this Complaint against Defendants H GREG
3 AUTO BUENA PARK LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; H GREG AUTO
4 MONROVIA LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; H GREG AUTO NEWPORT
5 BEACH, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; H GREG AUTO PUENTE HILLS LLC, a
6 California Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1-100, inclusive, inclusive, (collectively referred
7 to herein as “DEFENDANTS”). PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges as
8 follows:

9 **INTRODUCTION**

10 1. This is a representative action filed by PLAINTIFF on behalf of PLAINTIFF, all
11 Aggrieved Employees and the State of California against DEFENDANTS, pursuant to California’s
12 Private Attorney General Act, Labor Code section 2698 *et. seq.* (“PAGA”), to recover civil penalties
13 (75% payable to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and 25% payable to Aggrieved
14 Employees) for DEFENDANTS’ violations of the California Labor Code as alleged below.

15 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 2. This Court has jurisdiction over PLAINTIFF’s claims for penalties pursuant to
17 California statutes, including but not limited to the PAGA, and decisional law and regulations.

18 3. Venue is proper in the County of Orange pursuant to sections 395 and 395.5 of the
19 California Code of Civil Procedure section 395.5 because DEFENDANTS transact business within
20 this judicial district and conduct alleged by PLAINTIFF herein occurred in this this judicial district.
21 See also *Crestwood Behavioral Health, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2021) 60 Cal. App. 5th 1069 (venue
22 in a PAGA action is proper in any county where the defendants committed Labor Code violations
23 against some of its employees). Venue is also proper pursuant to section 393 of the California Code
24 of Civil Procedure because the cause, or some part of the cause, arose in the County of Orange.

25 **THE PARTIES**

26 4. PLAINTIFF is, and at all relevant times, was an individual domiciled in the State of
27 California and a citizen of the State of California.

28 5. PLAINTIFF is a former employee of DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF worked for
2
PLAINTIFF’S REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT

1 DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt employee with a job title of non-exempt finance and insurance
2 manager and/or a similar title(s) and/or position(s) from on or around August 21, 2021, through on
3 or around April 10, 2023. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS at DEFENDANTS' Buena Park,
4 California location(s).

5 6. Defendant H GREG AUTO BUENA PARK LLC is a California Limited Liability
6 Company that, at all relevant times, was authorized to do business within the State of California and
7 is doing business in the State of California.

8 7. Defendant H GREG AUTO MONROVIA LLC is a California Limited Liability
9 Company that, at all relevant times, was authorized to do business within the State of California and
10 is doing business in the State of California.

11 8. Defendant H GREG AUTO NEWPORT BEACH, LLC is a California Limited
12 Liability Company that, at all relevant times, was authorized to do business within the State of
13 California and is doing business in the State of California.

14 9. Defendant H GREG AUTO PUENTE HILLS LLC is a California Limited Liability
15 Company that, at all relevant times, was authorized to do business within the State of California and
16 is doing business in the State of California.

17 10. DEFENDANTS own, operate, manage and/or staff its employees to work at the
18 dealerships and/or facilities and/or other location(s) in California, including but not limited to the
19 dealerships and/or facilities in including but not limited to, Buena Park Monrovia, Newport Beach,
20 and La Puente, California. DEFENDANTS, through its various locations, serve the automotive
21 industry.¹

22 11. The true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants sued herein as DOES 1
23 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to PLAINTIFF, who therefore sues each such
24 Defendant by said fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally
25 responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. PLAINTIFF will seek leave of Court to amend this
26 Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Doe Defendants when such identities
27 become known.

28 ¹ See <https://www.hgreg.com/>. Last visited on January 23, 2024.

12. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, joint employer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged in this complaint. PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, and that at all relevant times, each Defendant knew or should have known about, authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

JOINT LIABILITY

13. Under California law, the definition of the terms “to employ” are broadly construed under the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) to have three alternative definitions, including: (1) to exercise control over the wages, hours or working conditions; (2) to suffer or permit to work; or (3) to engage, thereby creating a common law employment relationship. See, *Martinez v. Combs*, 49 Cal.4th 35, 64 (2010). One reason that the IWC defined “employer” in terms of exercising control was to reach situations in which multiple entities control different aspects of the employment relationship. Supervision of the work, in the specific sense of exercising control over how services are properly performed, is properly viewed as one of the “working conditions” mentioned in the wage order. *Id.* at 76. A joint employer relationship exists, for example, when one entity (such as a temporary employment agency) hires and pays a worker, and the other entity supervises the work. *Id.* Moreover, the California Court of Appeal recently broadened the test for joint employment in California, applying a less stringent standard to what constitutes sufficient control by a business over its vendor’s employees’ wages and working conditions to render that business liable as a joint employer. See, *Medina v. Equilon Enterprises, LLC*, 68 Cal. App. 5th 868 (2021); “[i]f the putative joint employer instead exercises enough control over the intermediary entity to *indirectly* dictate the wages, hours, or working conditions of the employee, that is a sufficient showing of joint employment,” *Id.* at 875 [emphasis added].

1 14. During PLAINTIFF's employment by DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFF and other
2 Aggrieved Employees (defined below) were jointly employed by DEFENDANTS for purposes of
3 the Wage Orders, under the alternative definitions of "to employ" adopted by the California
4 Supreme Court in *Martinez*, supra. As discussed below, these DEFENDANTS (1) exercised control
5 over wages, hours and working conditions of PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees; (2) suffered
6 or permitted PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees to work for them; and (3) engaged PLAINTIFF
7 and Aggrieved Employees to work for them.

8 15. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all relevant times
9 DEFENDANTS operated as a single integrated enterprise with common ownership and centralized
10 human resources. As a result, DEFENDANTS utilized the same unlawful policies and practices
11 across all of their locations/facilities and subjected all of the Aggrieved Employees to these same
12 policies and practices regardless of the location(s) where they worked. Among other things,
13 PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that: (1) there is common ownership in, and financial control,
14 in DEFENDANTS' companies, (2) DEFENDANTS utilize common management, who have control
15 over the day-to-day operations and employment matters, including the power to hire and fire, set
16 schedules, issue employee policies, and determine rates of compensation across its locations in
17 California; (3) DEFENDANTS utilize the same policies and procedures for all California
18 employees, including issuing the same employee handbooks and other form agreements; (4)
19 DEFENDANTS use at least some of the same Human Resources personnel and attorneys to oversee
20 employment matters; and, (6) DEFENDANTS share employees.

21 16. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all times relevant
22 to this Complaint, DEFENDANTS were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved
23 Employees upon whose behalf PLAINTIFF brings these allegations and cause of action, in that
24 DEFENDANTS, exercised sufficient control over PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees'
25 wages, hours and working conditions, and/or suffered or permitted them to work so as to be
26 considered the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees.

27 17. For example, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS, and each of them,
28 share the same principal business office and agent for service of process as provided to the California

1 Secretary of State and share some of the same attorneys and human resources personnel to oversee
2 employment-related matters.

3 18. Upon information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges that DEFENDANTS created a
4 uniform set of policies, practices and/or procedures concerning, inter alia, hourly and overtime pay,
5 time-keeping practices, meal and rest periods, reimbursement of business expenses and other
6 working conditions that were distributed to, and/or applied to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved
7 Employees, and further that DEFENDANTS uniformly compensated and controlled the wages of
8 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees in a uniform manner. DEFENDANTS collectively
9 represented to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees that each was an "at-will" employee of
10 DEFENDANTS, and that DEFENDANTS collectively retained the right to terminate PLAINTIFF's
11 and other Aggrieved Employees' employment with or without cause. Upon information and belief,
12 DEFENDANTS further collectively represented to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees in
13 writing the details of their compensation, and the manner in which they were to take meal and rest
14 periods, the procedures required by DEFENDANTS collectively for recordation of hours worked
15 and the policies applicable to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees by which DEFENDANTS
16 collectively would evaluate their wage rates.

17 19. Thus, DEFENDANTS collectively exercised the right to control the wages, hours
18 and working conditions of PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees. As such, DEFENDANTS
19 collectively held the right to control virtually every aspect of PLAINTIFF's and the Aggrieved
20 Employees' employment, including the instrumentality that resulted in the illegal conduct for which
21 PLAINTIFF seeks relief in this Complaint.

22 20. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that DEFENDANTS exercised the same
23 control over, applied the same policies and practices, and engaged in the same acts and omissions
24 with regard to the other Aggrieved Employees.

25 21. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and hereon alleges that DEEFENDANTS must
26 be classified as joint employers of PLAINTIFF for purposes of liability for civil penalties under
27 PAGA, as the aforementioned entities engaged, suffered and permitted PLAINTIFF to perform
28 services from which they benefited, and furthermore that the aforementioned entities had the right

1 to exercise control over the wages, hours and/or working conditions of PLAINTIFF at all relevant
2 times herein, so as to be considered the joint employers of PLAINTIFF.

3 22. By reason of their status as joint employers of PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved
4 Employees, DEFENDANTS are each liable for civil penalties for violations of the California Labor
5 Code and applicable Wage Orders as to all Aggrieved Employees.

6 **PAGA ALLEGATIONS**

7 23. PLAINTIFF brings this action under the PAGA, as a representative action on behalf
8 of the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees, regarding violations of the California Labor
9 Code as set forth herein as to all Aggrieved Employees. Said “Aggrieved Employees” include:

10 All current and former non-exempt employees that worked either
11 directly or via a staffing agency for any one or more of the
12 DEFENDANTS at any location in California at any time from one
13 year plus 65 days from the filing of the initial Complaint through the
14 present (“PAGA Period”).

15 24. PLAINTIFF is an “aggrieved employee,” as that term is defined under Labor Code
16 section 2699(c), as PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS during the applicable statutory
17 limitations period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code violations set forth herein.
18 Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to recover on behalf of the State of California, and all Aggrieved
19 Employees, the civil penalties provided by PAGA, plus reasonable attorney's fees and costs.
20 PLAINTIFF has standing to bring a PAGA cause of action on behalf of the State and all Aggrieved
21 Employees, as PLAINTIFF was jointly employed by DEFENDANTS and is thereby affected by
22 one or more of the alleged violations. *See Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23
23 Cal.App.5th 745, 757. A PAGA plaintiff has authority to seek penalties for all known violations
24 committed by the employer – regardless of whether Plaintiff experienced all violations personally.
25 *Id.* at 760-761.

26 **COMPLIANCE WITH PAGA’S NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

27 25. PLAINTIFF, on November 16, 2023, through counsel, gave written notice by online
28 filing with the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) informing it that

1 DEFENDANTS failed to comply with California’s labor laws with regard to the allegations alleged
2 in this Complaint (“PAGA Notice”).

3 26. The PAGA Notice outlined PLAINTIFF’s claims for violations of the California
4 Labor Code and the applicable wage orders on behalf of the State of California and all Aggrieved
5 Employees.

6 27. The LWDA did not provide notice of its intention to investigate DEFENDANTS’
7 violations after expiration of the 65-day waiting time period, or at any time. To the extent any of the
8 alleged violations were curable, DEFENDANTS failed to cure within the time allotted by PAGA.
9 PLAINTIFF has exhausted the administrative remedies as required by Labor Code section 2699.3.
10 Consequently, PLAINTIFF’s right to file the instant lawsuit has duly accrued.

11 28. PLAINTIFF seeks to recover the PAGA civil penalties through a representative
12 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46
13 Cal.4th 969. Therefore, class certification of the PAGA claims is not required.

14 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

15 29. During the relevant period, PLAINTIFF, and each of the Aggrieved Employees
16 worked for DEFENDANTS in the State of California. At all times referenced herein,
17 DEFENDANTS exercised control over PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees, and suffered and/or
18 permitted them to work.

19 30. PLAINTIFF is a former employee of DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF worked for
20 DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt employee with a job title of non-exempt finance and insurance
21 manager and/or a similar title(s) and/or position(s) from on or around August 21, 2021, through on
22 or around April 10, 2023.

23 31. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS at DEFENDANTS’ Buena Park, California
24 location(s).

25 32. PLAINTIFF regularly worked at least eight (8) hours per day, at least five (5) days
26 per week.

27 33. At all relevant times, PLAINTIFF was a non-exempt employee that was paid on an
28 hourly basis for time counted by DEFENDANTS as hours worked. PLAINTIFF was also

1 compensated with commissions, bonuses/incentive pay, spiffs and/or other non-discretionary
2 compensation.

3 34. **Unpaid Minimum and Overtime Wages.** DEFENDANTS failed to compensate
4 PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, resulting in the underpayment of
5 minimum and overtime wages. DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved
6 Employees for all hours worked by virtue of, DEFENDANTS' automatic deduction and time
7 rounding policies, and failure to relieve employees of all duties/employer control during unpaid
8 meal periods or otherwise unlawful practices for missed or improper meal periods, as explained
9 below.

10 35. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented a policy and/or
11 practice of rounding meal period start and end times and/or automatically deducting at least thirty
12 minutes per shift for meal periods, despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that
13 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were subject to DEFENDANTS' control during
14 purported meal periods and/or were otherwise not afforded lawful meal periods, depriving
15 PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees of all wages owed.

16 36. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were not paid for all hours
17 worked due to DEFENDANTS' policy and/or practice of paying according to scheduled hours
18 worked instead of actual time worked, time rounding policies and practices, and/or mandated off-
19 the clock work policies and/or practices.

20 37. For example, DEFENDANTS' wage statements for PLAINTIFF evidence rounding
21 of PLAINTIFF's total hours worked to at least the nearest quarter, half and/or whole hour. For
22 example, DEFENDANTS' wage statement for PLAINTIFF for pay date October 7, 2022 shows
23 precisely 56.00 regular hours worked and precisely 17.50 overtime hours worked; similarly,
24 DEFENDANTS' wage statement for PLAINTIFF for pay date November 25, 2022 shows precisely
25 72.00 regular hours worked and precisely 18.50 overtime hours worked; DEFENDANTS' wage
26 statement for PLAINTIFF for pay date December 9, 2022 shows precisely 72.00 regular hours
27 worked and precisely 22.00 overtime hours worked; DEFENDANTS' wage statement for
28 PLAINTIFF for pay date of December 23, 2022 shows precisely 75.50 regular hours worked;

1 DEFENDANTS' wage statement for pay date of January 10, 2023 shows precisely 123.00 regular
2 hours worked; similarly, DEFENDANTS' wage statement for PLAINTIFF for pay date of March
3 24, 2023 shows exactly 126.75 regular hours worked. Based on information and belief,
4 DEFENDANTS rounded PLAINTIFF's total hours worked to at least the nearest quarter, half and/or
5 whole hour during most if not all pay periods during his employment.

6 38. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS suffered, permitted, explicitly
7 instructed and/or otherwise required Aggrieved Employees to perform pre-shift and/or post-shift
8 off-the-clock work/off-the-clock work outside of scheduled shift times, such as but not limited to,
9 contacting prospective customers/customers, financial institutions, completing paperwork and/or
10 data entry, cleaning and/or setting up DEFENDANTS' facilities and/or showroom(s), making
11 and/or responding to work-related communications and/or completing other off-the-clock work
12 tasks that were neither recorded nor compensated, resulting in DEFENDANTS' failure to pay
13 Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked and the underpayment of minimum wages and overtime
14 wages owed to Aggrieved Employees.

15 39. For example, PLAINTIFF was frequently required to perform off-the-clock work
16 tasks prior to clocking in/signing in for the start of his shift and/or after clocking out/signing out for
17 the end of his shift and/or otherwise outside of scheduled shift times.

18 40. For example, PLAINTIFF was frequently required to go into DEFENDANTS'
19 dealership on his scheduled days off to including but not limited to, perform data entry, make and/or
20 respond to work-related communications and/or perform other off-the-clock work tasks, resulting
21 in DEFENDANTS' failure to pay for all hours worked and the underpayment of wages owed to
22 PLAINTIFF.

23 41. Based on information and belief, prior to beginning a scheduled shift, Aggrieved
24 Employees were required to start and/or boot all of DEFENDANTS' computer systems, phone
25 systems / applications and/or software so as to have all systems running at the start of the scheduled
26 shift. As such, based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees at times spent at least 10-15
27 minutes before each scheduled shift preparing and/or troubleshooting different work applications in
28 order to clock in and begin their shifts. This pre-shift work was off-the-clock and uncompensated

1 resulting in unpaid minimum and overtime wages.

2 42. Based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS' electronic employee
3 time-keeping system/app malfunctioned such that Aggrieved Employees were required to either
4 reinitiate and/or otherwise troubleshoot the system prior to being able to clock in and/or were unable
5 to clock in at all for the start of their shifts and/or clock back in from meal periods, resulting in off-
6 the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed to Aggrieved Employees. Based on
7 information and belief, Aggrieved Employees experienced the same issues when clocking out for
8 shifts and/or back in for meal periods. This time spent under DEFENDANTS' control was not
9 recorded and not compensated and resulted in unpaid minimum wages owed to Aggrieved
10 Employees.

11 43. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not compensate Aggrieved
12 Employees for all time spent donning and doffing personal protective equipment, safety equipment
13 and/or uniforms/work clothing (e.g., gloves, goggles/safety glasses and/or face masks) during meal
14 periods, before the start of a scheduled shift, and after completing a scheduled shift, resulting in
15 DEFENDANTS' failure to pay Aggrieved Employees for all work time and the underpayment of
16 minimum wages and overtime wages owed to Aggrieved Employees.

17 44. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo
18 security screenings and/or other mandated screenings before and/or after a scheduled shift and/or
19 before or after clocking in/out for work, resulting in pre-shift and/or post-shift off-the-clock work.

20 45. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
21 undergo COVID-19 temperature screenings and/or complete questionnaires prior to beginning their
22 scheduled shift and/or prior to clocking/signing in, thereby, resulting in pre-shift off-the-clock work.

23 46. Based on information and belief, at times, Aggrieved Employees were required to
24 complete other work tasks outside of their reported work time, before clocking in for the start of
25 their shift and/or after clocking out for the end of their shift and/or otherwise outside of their
26 scheduled shift times resulting in DEFENDANTS' failure to compensate Aggrieved Employees for
27 all hours worked and the underpayment of minimum wages and overtime wages to Aggrieved
28 Employees.

1 47. For example, based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were required
2 to complete off-the-clock work outside of scheduled shifts due to, including but not limited to, work-
3 related phone calls and/or messages they received to their phones and were required to respond to,
4 including but not limited to, communications from supervisors and/or other Aggrieved Employees
5 regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks, resulting in the underpayment of minimum and
6 overtime wages owed to Aggrieved Employees.

7 48. Based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS instituted a piece-rate-
8 based compensation scheme that resulted in pay periods during which Aggrieved Employees were
9 denied the minimum wage for all hours worked.

10 49. For example, on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS paid Aggrieved
11 Employees on a strictly commission and/or piece-rate basis (e.g., per repair/service job and/or sale
12 completed and/or using a flagged hour basis), at least during some pay periods, during the relevant
13 time period. However, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to separately
14 compensate Aggrieved Employees for all non-piece rate related activities/all non-productive time,
15 including but not limited to, all rest breaks and/or time spent preparing/setting up for jobs, time
16 spent completing paperwork, waiting between jobs and tasks and/or other waiting time, and/or
17 performing work duties that otherwise fall outside of the piece-rate pay criteria. DEFENDANTS'
18 failure to separately compensate Aggrieved Employees for their rest periods and/or other non-
19 productive time and/or failure to compensate them at the correct rates for all non-productive time
20 including rest periods resulted in the failure to pay Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked and
21 violations of California wage and hour laws, including but not limited to, Labor Code sections 226.2
22 and/or 1197. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed to include this
23 information on these employees' wage statements required by Labor Code section 226.2.

24 50. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay Aggrieved
25 Employees the applicable minimum wage for the county and/or city within which the Aggrieved
26 Employee worked in California.

27 51. For example, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay
28 Aggrieved Employees who performed at least two (2) hours of work within the city of Los Angeles

1 and/or within an unincorporated area of the county of Los Angeles, at the applicable minimum wage
2 rate(s) in effect for the city and/or county of Los Angeles, and as such failed to pay all owed
3 minimum wages.

4 52. For example, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS paid Aggrieved
5 Employees an hourly rate that was \$15.50 per hour and/or otherwise below the minimum wage rate
6 in effect for the city and/or county of Los Angeles. See Section 187.02(d) of the Los Angeles
7 Municipal Code (increasing the minimum wage rate, effective July 1, 2023, by \$.74 for a new
8 minimum wage rate of \$16.78 per hour) and Los Angeles County Minimum Wage Ordinance
9 section 8.100.040 (increasing the minimum wage rate for the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles
10 to \$16.90 per hour).

11 53. Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay Aggrieved
12 Employees split shift premium wages when they worked split shifts during the relevant period. For
13 example, based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees
14 to work two separate shifts in the same day. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed
15 to pay Aggrieved Employees split shift compensation whenever PLAINTIFF's and/or other
16 Aggrieved Employees' work schedules were interrupted by non-paid non-working periods
17 established by DEFENDANTS, which resulted in a violation of the applicable Wage Order (See
18 section 4 of all applicable Wage orders, "When an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay
19 at the minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday...). See, also,
20 Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11050 (when an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay at the
21 minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday, except when the
22 employee resides at the place of employment). DEFENDANTS also failed to separately itemize
23 these split shift premium wages on PLAINTIFF's and/or other Aggrieved Employees' wage
24 statements, in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders.
25 See, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dlse/split_shift.htm. (The employer must itemize the premium
26 payment on the pay stub provided to the employee, and it should be shown as a separate category
27 such as "Split Shift Premium" and should not be lumped into another category such as wages, bonus,
28 etc. DEFENDANTS failed to separately account for the split shift premiums earned by PLAINTIFF

1 and/or other Aggrieved Employees on their wage statements.

2 54. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay Aggrieved
3 Employees for time they were required to spend completing orientation, policy questionnaires,
4 and/or time spent completing the onboarding process including but not limited to reviewing various
5 documents and policies provided by DEFENDANTS. Based on information and belief, this work
6 time was completed off-the-clock and was not compensated.

7 55. Based in information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented a time-rounding
8 system that as applied systematically deprived PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees of
9 compensable time because the time-rounding system implemented by DEFENDANTS would
10 almost always, if not always, result in understating actual compensable work time.

11 56. For example, DEFENDANTS' wage statements for PLAINTIFF evidence rounding
12 of PLAINTIFF's total hours worked to at least the nearest quarter, half and/or whole hour. For
13 example, DEFENDANTS' wage statement for PLAINTIFF for pay date October 7, 2022 shows
14 precisely 56.00 regular hours worked and precisely 17.50 overtime hours worked; similarly,
15 DEFENDANTS' wage statement for PLAINTIFF for pay date November 25, 2022 shows precisely
16 72.00 regular hours worked and precisely 18.50 overtime hours worked; DEFENDANTS' wage
17 statement for PLAINTIFF for pay date December 9, 2022 shows precisely 72.00 regular hours
18 worked and precisely 22.00 overtime hours worked; DEFENDANTS' wage statement for
19 PLAINTIFF for pay date of December 23, 2022 shows precisely 75.50 regular hours worked;
20 DEFENDANTS' wage statement for pay date of January 10, 2023 shows precisely 123.00 regular
21 hours worked; similarly, DEFENDANTS' wage statement for PLAINTIFF for pay date of March
22 24, 2023 shows exactly 126.75 regular hours worked. Based on information and belief,
23 DEFENDANTS rounded PLAINTIFF's total hours worked to at least the nearest quarter, half and/or
24 whole hour during most if not all pay periods during his employment.

25 57. DEFENDANTS' failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of its time rounding,
26 auto-deduction policies and practices for unlawful meal periods, failure to provide lawful meal
27 periods, and/or other off-the-clock work practices and policies, resulted in the underpayment of
28 minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees as well as unpaid overtime wages

1 for those Aggrieved Employees who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day and/or more than
2 forty (40) hours in a week.

3 58. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive
4 knowledge that its time rounding policies/practices, auto-deduction policies and practices, failure to
5 provide lawful meal periods (as described below) and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in the
6 underpayment of minimum wages and overtime wages owed to Aggrieved Employees, in violation
7 of California's minimum and overtime wage laws.

8 59. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to pay
9 Aggrieved Employees two times their regular rate of pay for time worked beyond twelve (12) hours
10 per workday and for time worked beyond eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in
11 a work week, in violation of California's overtime laws.

12 60. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all non-
13 discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, shift differential pay, bonus pay/incentive
14 pay, multiple base rates of pay and/or other non-discretionary pay into the regular rate of pay used
15 to calculate the owed overtime rate(s), resulting in the miscalculation and underpayment of overtime
16 wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees.

17 61. **Meal Period Violations.** PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees consistently
18 worked shifts of at least five and one-half hours or more, entitling them to at least one meal period.
19 However, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees would not receive legally compliant thirty
20 (30) minute first and second meal periods. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees
21 were consistently unable to take timely, off duty, thirty-minute, uninterrupted meal periods, often
22 being forced to take late meal periods, interrupted meal periods, and/or work through part or all their
23 meal periods due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties and/or commentary
24 from supervisors pressuring them to take non-compliant meal periods or skip meal periods
25 completely.

26 62. For example, based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
27 Employees were forced to take late meal periods in order to complete assigned job duties. Based on
28 information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were at times interrupted

1 during purported meal periods and/or had meal periods cut short and/or restricted to
2 DEFENDANTS' premises due to the need to continue assigned job duties.

3 63. Also, based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees
4 were required to monitor their cell phones/mobile devices, walkie talkies, pagers and/or other work
5 communication devices and/or otherwise remain on-duty during meal periods. As such,
6 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duties and DEFENDANTS'
7 control during unpaid purportedly off-duty meal periods, resulting in denied meal periods as well as
8 DEFENDANTS' failure to pay PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked
9 and the underpayment of wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees.

10 64. Based on information and belief, other Aggrieved Employees were consistently
11 suffered and permitted to take meal periods past the fifth hour of work and/or had their meal periods
12 interrupted, cut short, and/or otherwise on duty due to commentary from supervisors, understaffing,
13 the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or the need to meet DEFENDANTS' goals and
14 expectations.

15 65. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or
16 practices that failed to relieve Aggrieved Employees of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control
17 during unpaid meal periods.

18 66. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
19 complete off-the-clock work prior to their scheduled shift time which DEFENDANTS failed to take
20 into account when scheduling meal periods for Aggrieved Employees. Based on information and
21 belief, meal periods were late, in part due to unaccounted pre-shift off-the-clock work.

22 67. Based on information and belief, despite DEFENDANTS' failure to provide lawful
23 meal periods, DEFENDANTS implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding the start and end
24 times of PLAINTIFF's and other Aggrieved Employees' meal periods and/or automatically
25 deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for missed, on-duty, and/or otherwise unlawful meal
26 periods despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
27 Employees did not receive lawful meal periods.

28 68. Moreover, based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees who worked shifts

1 of more than ten hours did not receive a second legally compliant thirty (30) minute meal period.

2 69. For example, when PLAINTIFF worked more than ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours
3 in a shift, PLAINTIFF was not provided with a second meal period.

4 70. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to instruct PLAINTIFF and
5 other Aggrieved Employees as to the timing and duty-free nature of meal periods. Based on further
6 information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not have a compliant written meal period policy, nor
7 did DEFENDANTS have any sort of compliant policy in practice.

8 71. Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to keep accurate
9 records of the true start and end times of PLAINTIFF's and Aggrieved Employees' meal periods.
10 Based on information and belief, to the extent meal periods were recorded, DEFENDANTS illegally
11 rounded the start and end times of purported meal periods resulting in PLAINTIFF and other
12 Aggrieved Employees not being paid for all time worked as well as late and/or shortened meal
13 periods. *See Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58.

14 72. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive
15 knowledge that its policies and practices resulted in the denial of timely uninterrupted meal periods
16 that were free of DEFENDANTS' control owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees, in
17 violation of California's meal period laws.

18 73. DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees, an
19 additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of compensation for each workday a lawful
20 meal period was not provided. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a meal period premium at all for
21 each workday a lawful meal period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper meal period
22 premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to,
23 bonuses, shift differential pay and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate or
24 compensation for purposes of calculating the owed meal period premium.

25 74. **Rest Period Violations.** DEFENDANTS did not properly authorize and provide
26 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant rest periods at a rate of every
27 four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, that insofar as practicable, are provided in the
28 middle of the work period, as required by law.

1 75. PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were not adequately informed,
2 authorized, instructed about, nor permitted an opportunity to take proper rest periods per California
3 law. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had no policy in place nor instruction as to
4 the taking or timing of duty-free rest periods.

5 76. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not have a have a compliant
6 written rest period policy, nor did DEFENDANTS have any sort of compliant rest period policy in
7 practice.

8 77. For example, based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
9 Employees were unable to take compliant rest periods due to their need to complete assigned job
10 duties and/or were unable to take a net ten-minute rest period in a suitable rest area and/or had
11 purported rest periods restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises. Also, based on information and
12 belief, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were required to monitor their cell
13 phones/mobile devices, walkie talkies, pagers and/or other work communication devices and/or
14 otherwise remain on-duty during any rest periods. As such, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
15 Employees were not relieved of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control during any rest periods, in
16 violation of California rest period law.

17 78. Based on information and belief, any purported rest periods were interrupted, cut
18 short, on duty, restricted to premises, and/or late due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of
19 their job duties, and/or commentary from supervisors pressuring them to skip rest periods
20 completely and/or take non-compliant rest periods.

21 79. Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide any
22 form of a third rest period on shifts lasting longer than ten hours.

23 80. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or
24 practices that failed to relieve PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees of all duties and
25 DEFENDANTS' control during rest periods.

26 81. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were pressured to complete
27 their work duties according to a designated schedule such that rest periods were only taken once
28 tasks were completed, and/or as time permitted.

1 82. Furthermore, DEFENDANTS failed to pay a rest period premium for each day in
2 which PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees experienced a missed/unlawful rest period in
3 violation of California law. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a rest period premium at all for each
4 workday a proper rest period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper rest period premium
5 for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses,
6 shift differential pay, and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of
7 compensation for purposes of calculating the owed rest period premium.

8 83. **Failure to Provide Suitable Resting Facilities.** Per section 13 of all applicable IWC
9 Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable resting facilities. Section 13(B) of the
10 Wage Orders provides: “Suitable resting facilities shall be provided in an area separate from the
11 toilet rooms and shall be available to employees during work hours.”

12 84. DEFENDANTS’ locations/facilities are generally similar in layout and design, and
13 there was, and continues to be, space that allows for a resting facility that employees may use to
14 cease work and recover during meal or rest periods. DEFENDANTS could have provided Aggrieved
15 Employees with a resting facility within DEFENDANTS’ facilities/locations with reasonable or no
16 modification, but instead denied and continues to deny, employees with suitable areas to rest (e.g. a
17 breakroom). As a result, Aggrieved Employees were forced to adjust to areas not conducive to
18 resting, including but not limited to leaning up against the wall, or search for facilities outside of
19 DEFENDANTS’ premises which are not designated or reserved for their rest, such as their personal
20 vehicles.

21 85. DEFENDANTS did not provide Aggrieved Employees with suitable resting facilities
22 during their hours of work, particularly during meal and/or rest periods.

23 86. DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide suitable resting facilities to Aggrieved
24 Employees violated and continue to violate the applicable Wage Order, section 13(B) and the
25 California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

26 87. **Inaccurate Wage Statements.** During the relevant period, DEFENDANTS failed to
27 provide PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate wage statements that complied
28 with Labor Code section 226. As DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved

1 Employees with meal and rest periods that complied with Labor section 226.7, the wage statements
2 DEFENDANTS issued to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees failed and continue to fail to
3 correctly set forth the gross wages earned, the total hours worked, the net wages earned, and all
4 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
5 worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

6 88. DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
7 Employees that also failed to indicate the earned gross and net wages earned during the pay period,
8 the correct applicable rates of pay for all hours worked, and the total hours worked by PLAINTIFF
9 and Aggrieved Employees (by virtue of rounded time entries, automatic deduction for meal
10 periods/failure to relieve Aggrieved Employees of all duties and employer control during unpaid
11 meal periods, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather than actual hours worked, and/or
12 other off-the-clock work policies and practices described above) which results in a violation of
13 Labor Code section 226(a).

14 89. Separately, and independent of the above allegations, based on information and
15 belief, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to Aggrieved Employees that failed to list the total
16 hours worked, in violation of including but not limited to, Labor Code section 226(a)(2).

17 90. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to
18 Aggrieved Employees that failed to list the number of piece-rate units earned and/or all applicable
19 piece rate(s) of pay, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(3).

20 91. Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed
21 to list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
22 hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of, including but not limited to, Labor
23 Code section 226(a)(9).

24 92. For example, based on information and belief, wage statements issued by
25 DEFENDANTS failed to list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
26 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor
27 Code section 226(a)(9) due to DEFENDANTS' failure to list an overtime rate category at all and/or
28 failure to list a category containing the proper overtime rate.

1 93. Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements
2 to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees that further violate Labor Code section 226(a), by among
3 other things, failing to list the correct name and/or address of the legal entity that is the employer,
4 in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(8).

5 94. Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed
6 to list the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the Aggrieved Employee is being paid.

7 95. For example, based on information and belief, wage statements issued by
8 DEFENDANTS failed to list the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the Aggrieved
9 Employee is being paid. For example, based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS
10 issued wage statements to Aggrieved Employees containing payment for hours worked during
11 previous pay periods, yet DEFENDANTS' wage statements do not include the inclusive dates of
12 the accurate pay period for that retroactive pay, further failing to list the total hours worked for the
13 pay period, including but not limited to, the total hours worked for the pay period the retroactive
14 pay corresponds with. For example, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS' wage
15 statements provided to Aggrieved Employees list a category for "Retro" and/or retroactive pay
16 without including the inclusive dates of the accurate pay period for that retroactive pay, further
17 failing to list the total hours worked for the pay period, including but not limited to, the total hours
18 worked for the pay period the retroactive pay corresponds with, in violation of including but not
19 limited to, Labor Code sections 226(a)(2) and/or 226(a)(6).

20 96. As such, DEFENDANTS' issued wage statements to Aggrieved Employees that did
21 not include all of the statutorily required information, including but not limited to, the correct name
22 and/or address of the legal entity that is the employer.

23 97. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to
24 Aggrieved Employees that failed to list the accurate total hours worked whenever shift differential
25 wages were paid in violation of Labor Code section 226.

26 98. As a result, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved
27 Employees that were not accurate and did not include all of the statutorily required information. As
28 such, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 226.

1 99. **Unlawful Deductions.** Labor Code section 221 prohibits an employer from
2 “collect[ing] or receiv[ing] from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer
3 to said employee.” Based on information and belief DEFENDANTS made unlawful deductions
4 from Aggrieved Employees paychecks during the relevant period including but not limited to,
5 deducting costs of uniforms and/or other business costs and/or deducting wages for purported
6 overpayments from previous pay periods and/or unlawfully deducting wages for negligently
7 damaged property. Such a practice is in violation of including but not limited to, Labor Code
8 Sections 221-222 which subjects DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code Section 2699.

9 100. **Inaccurate Records.** Based on the above-described unlawful policies and practices,
10 DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail, to keep accurate and complete payroll records as
11 required by Labor Code sections 1174, 1198, 1199, and section 7 of all applicable Wage Orders.
12 DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to keep accurate and complete payroll records as
13 required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked,
14 applicable rates of pay, time records showing when PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees
15 began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and accurate itemized wage
16 statements.

17 101. DEFENDANTS have failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete
18 records showing total hours worked by virtue of DEFENDANTS’ time rounding, automatic meal
19 period deductions, failure to relieve PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees of all duties and
20 employer control during unpaid meal periods, failure to record the true start and end times of meal
21 periods, shift start times and shift end times, and other off-the-clock work policies and practices
22 described herein.

23 102. **Failure to Provide Written Commission Agreements.** Labor Code section 2751
24 requires that all commission contracts “be in writing and . . . set forth the method by which the
25 commissions shall be computed and paid.” Cal. Lab. Code section 2751(a) (2012). Under the statute,
26 employers must also “give a signed copy of the contract to every employee who is a party [to the
27 contract] and . . . obtain a signed receipt for the contract from each employee.” *Id.* section 2751(b).

28 103. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Aggrieved

1 Employees who were compensated on a commission basis with proper written commission
2 agreements, in violation of Labor Code section 2751.

3 104. **Violation of Labor Code Section 226.2.** Labor Code section 226.2 requires an
4 employer to pay employees compensated on a piece-rate basis separately for rest and recovery
5 periods and nonproductive time, apart from any piece-rate pay. This statute further requires an
6 employer to include on the wage statements for these employees the total hours of compensable rest
7 and recovery period, the total hours for other non-productive time, the rates of compensation for
8 these hours, and the gross wages paid for these hours. In addition, the statute requires that employees
9 shall be compensated for rest and recovery periods at a regular hourly rate that is no less than the
10 higher of: (i) an average hourly rate determined by dividing the total compensation for the
11 workweek, exclusive of compensation for rest and recovery periods and any premium compensation
12 for overtime, by the total hours worked during the workweek, exclusive of rest and recovery periods,
13 or (ii) The applicable minimum wage. Per case law, Labor Code section 226.2 also applies to
14 employees compensated on a commission basis.

15 105. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate Aggrieved
16 Employees who were paid solely on a piece rate and/or commission basis separately for the rest
17 periods and nonproductive time, and/or failed to pay them for this time at the correct rates. Based
18 on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed to include this information on Aggrieved
19 Employees' wage statements. As such, DEFENDANTS failed to comply with Labor Code section
20 226.2.

21 106. **Unreimbursed Business Expenses.** Based on information and belief,
22 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees to incur business expenses
23 as a direct consequence of the performance of their job duties without providing reimbursement, in
24 violation of Labor Code section 2802. Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other
25 Aggrieved Employees were improperly required to provide and maintain work tools that are
26 supposed to be the responsibility of the employer.

27 107. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS shifted the costs of doing business
28 onto Aggrieved Employees by requiring them to pay for business expenses, including but not limited

1 to, uniforms, work clothing/shoes, protective equipment/safety gear (e.g., gloves and/or face masks)
2 and/or the use of Aggrieved Employees' personal mobile phone and data usage for work-related
3 purposes, including but not limited to, receiving and responding to work related messages and/or
4 phone calls.

5 108. For example, PLAINTIFF was consistently required to use his personal cell
6 phone/mobile device to make and receive work-related communications, however, DEFENDANTS
7 failed to provide PLAINTIFF with any and/or full reimbursement for the business expenses he
8 incurred in connection with being required to use his personal cell phone/mobile device for work,
9 including without limitation, increased data plan charges. Based on information and belief, other
10 Aggrieved Employees were also required to make and/or receive also work-related calls/messages
11 to/from their personal phones/mobile devices from managers and/or supervisors, DEFENDANTS'
12 customers, and/or other Aggrieved Employees without receiving any and/or full reimbursement
13 from DEFENDANTS for these business expenses.

14 109. Also, PLAINTIFF was required to purchase uniforms/work clothing/work shoes,
15 including but not limited to, slacks/pants of a specific color and/or specific brand as mandated by
16 DEFENDANTS, however, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF with any and/or full
17 reimbursement for the business expenses he incurred in connection with the purchase and/or
18 maintenance of DEFENDANTS' uniforms/required work clothing/work shoes.

19 110. Moreover, based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees also were required
20 to use and did use personal devices to perform work duties at home/remotely, such as, but not limited
21 to, reviewing and/or completing work-related paperwork and/or other documents as mandated by
22 DEFENDANTS, however DEFENDANTS failed to provide reimbursement / full reimbursement
23 for expenses Aggrieved Employees incurred as a result of working for DEFENDANTS remotely
24 and/or from their homes, including but not limited to, cost of internet service, home electricity, cost
25 of additional memory and/or virus software for home computer / home computer use, among other
26 business expenses associated with remote work required by DEFENDANTS.

27 111. Based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for the
28 business use of their personal vehicles, including but not limited to, mileage, wear and tear, and/or

1 cost of fuel when they were required to drive between job sites/facilities and/or otherwise use their
2 personal vehicles for DEFENDANTS' business purposes.

3 112. For example, based on information and belief, at times, Aggrieved Employees were
4 required to use their personal vehicles to drive between DEFENDANTS' various facilities, offices
5 and/or locations and/or otherwise use their personal vehicles to carry out their assigned job duties
6 but were not provided any and/or full reimbursement for DEFENDANTS' business use of their
7 personal vehicles. As such, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate Aggrieved Employees at the
8 Internal Revenue Service (IRS) mandated per mile compensation rate for the relevant period.

9 113. Based on further information and belief, Aggrieved Employees were at times
10 required to supply (purchase and/or maintain) their own hand tools and/or equipment they required
11 to perform their assigned job duties, however, they did not receive any and/or full reimbursement
12 from DEFENDANTS for the expenses incurred in connection therewith.

13 114. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to reimburse and
14 indemnify Aggrieved Employees for business expenses. Pursuant to California Labor Code section
15 2802, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be reimbursed for all reasonable
16 expenses associated with carrying out DEFENDANTS' orders and/or carrying out the duties
17 assigned by DEFENDANTS.

18 115. DEFENDANTS' failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with full reimbursement
19 for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required that Aggrieved
20 Employees subsidize and/or carry the burden of business expenses in violation of Labor Code section
21 2802.

22 116. **Reporting Time Pay Violations.** Section 5 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders,
23 provides as follows:

24 117. (A) Each workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is
25 not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the
26 employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two
27 (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less
28 than the minimum wage. (B) If an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one

1 workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting said employee
2 shall be paid for two hours at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the
3 minimum wage.

4 118. Aggrieved Employees were not paid reporting time wages in accordance with
5 California law, including but not limited to the applicable IWC Wage Order. For example, based on
6 information and belief, at times, PLAINTIFF and/or other Aggrieved Employees reported to work
7 for a scheduled shift but were sent home and/or were not put to work and were not paid all owed
8 reporting time pay wages in accordance with California law.

9 119. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of
10 failing to pay all reporting time wages to Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California law,
11 including but not limited to, the applicable IWC Wage Order, Section 5. DEFENDANTS' failure to
12 pay all reporting time wages to Aggrieved Employees violated and continues to violate the
13 applicable Wage Order, and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

14 120. **Violation of California Day of Rest Law.** Under California law, every employee in
15 California is "entitled" to "one day's rest [from labor] in seven"; and, no employer may "cause" its
16 employees "to work more than six days in seven." *See* Labor Code Sections 551 and 552. Labor
17 Code section 553 provides that a violation of the foregoing sections is a misdemeanor.

18 121. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have and continue to have a
19 uniform policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to work at least seven days
20 consecutively in a workweek, in violation of including but not limited to, Labor Code Section
21 551. Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and/or other Aggrieved Employees were
22 suffered, permitted, or required to work at least seven (7) days consecutively in a workweek, in
23 violation of California law, including but not limited to Labor Code Section 551.

24 122. **Sick Leave Violations.** Throughout the relevant time period, DEFENDANTS failed
25 to provide proper paid sick leave to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees. DEFENDANTS
26 either failed to provide paid sick leave at all or improperly calculated the sick leave accrual and the
27 sick leave rate of pay owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees by failing to base the
28 accrued sick leave hours on the correct number of hours worked (as a result of the

1 rounding/automatic deduction policies and practices for meal periods and/or shift start and end
2 times/other required off-the-clock work including but not limited to unpaid meal periods) and by
3 failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including but
4 not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses, shift differential pay, and/or other non-discretionary
5 compensation into the sick leave pay rate calculation.

6 123. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed to place PLAINTIFF
7 and Aggrieved Employees on notice of their paid sick leave rights – or thereby putting their
8 entitlement to sick leave in a Labor Code section 2810.5 notice. Based on information and belief,
9 DEFENDANTS failed to provide notice of the correct sick leave amount balance available to
10 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees on their wage statements or other written statement.
11 Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain accurate records of
12 used sick leave and the balance of paid sick leave.

13 124. Based on information and belief, throughout the relevant time period,
14 DEFENDANTS failed to provide notice of the balance of sick leave pay left for PLAINTIFF and
15 all Aggrieved Employees, thus affecting their intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave. But for
16 this failure, PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved Employees would have used their paid sick leave at least
17 prior to their respective separations, for as on several occasions thereafter, he or she would have
18 been entitled to use the banked sick leave and earn appropriate compensation.

19 125. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to comply
20 with Labor Code section 246, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved Employees with
21 a Labor Code section 226 wage statement, or separate writing containing the amount of paid sick
22 leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays
23 wages.

24 126. As such, DEFENDANTS have violated California's paid sick leave laws and
25 unlawfully retained and continue to retain paid sick leave that should have been paid and was not as
26 a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to properly institute a lawful paid sick leave program. These
27 unlawful practices and policies violate Labor Code sections 245-248.5.

28 127. **Failure To Provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave.** Labor Code § 248.2 provides

1 that all employers with 26 or more employees are required to provide up to 80 hours for covered
2 employees to take 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave to care for themselves, to care
3 for a family member or if it is vaccine-related. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS
4 violated Labor Code § 248.2 by not providing Aggrieved Employees with required 2021 COVID-
5 19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to
6 provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave in 2022 in violation of Labor Code section 248.6.

7 128. **Seating Violations.** Per section 14(A-B) of all applicable IWC Wage Orders,
8 employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the
9 use of seats and when they are not actively engaged in the work duties that would not permit them
10 to be seated.

11 129. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, Section 14(A-B) provides:

12 (A) All working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the
13 work reasonably permits the use of seats.

14 (B) When employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the
15 nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in
16 reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it
17 does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

18 130. Suitable seating is one of the worker protections covered by California's Wage
19 Orders, which have the same dignity as statutes, are remedial in nature and are to be broadly
20 construed to effectuate the goal of protecting the comfort and welfare of employees. *Brinker*
21 *Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1027 (2012).

22 131. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Aggrieved
23 Employees with suitable seating, and when such employees were not engaged in duties which
24 required them to stand, no seating was placed in reasonable proximity to their workstations.

25 132. Moreover, based on information and belief, the nature of the work reasonably
26 permitted the use of seats for at least part of the time that Aggrieved Employees were working.
27 Lastly, there were periods of time when Aggrieved Employees were not engaged in active duties of
28 their employment, yet there were no suitable seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and use

1 of seats would not interfere with the performance of their duties.

2 **133. Failure to Pay Vested Vacation/Paid Time Off.** Based on information and belief,
3 DEFENDANTS have and continue to have a uniform policy and practice of failing to allow
4 Aggrieved Employees to use their earned vacation/paid time off during their employment and/or
5 failing to pay all vested, accrued paid time off (including but not limited to, all owed vacation
6 pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary compensation, including but not
7 limited to, shift differentials) to Aggrieved Employees upon separation of employment, in violation
8 of California law, including but not limited to, Labor Code section 227.3.

9 **134. Failure to Timely Pay All Wages Upon Separation of Employment.** Based on
10 information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees all wages that
11 were due and owing upon termination or resignation. Based on information and belief,
12 DEFENDANTS untimely provide final wages to Aggrieved Employees without regard to the timing
13 requirements of Labor Code sections 201-202.

14 **135.** Upon separation of employment, Aggrieved Employees' final paychecks were not
15 timely provided and/or were not timely provided with all owed vacation pay and/or paid time off.
16 Moreover, Aggrieved Employees' final paychecks, once provided, did not include all wages owed
17 as they were devoid of, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages,
18 premium wages, vacation pay, and all owed sick leave and/or paid time off wages at the properly
19 accrued rates (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate
20 including non-discretionary compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials).

21 **136.** Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely provide all
22 owed wages immediately upon discharge of employment. Based on information and belief, at times,
23 Aggrieved Employees experienced breaks in employment caused by DEFENDANTS whereby
24 Aggrieved Employees would not be called in for work for longer than a single pay period due to
25 including but not limited to DEFENDANTS' lack of work or lack of assignments. Such instances
26 qualify as a discharge of employment. Yet, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay all owed wages at
27 the end of such periods of employment, in violation of including but not limited to Labor Code
28 section 201-202.

1 **Violation of Labor Code Section 208**

2 137. Labor Code Section 208 provides: Every employee who is discharged shall be paid
3 at the place of discharge, and every employee who quits shall be paid at the office or agency of the
4 employer in the county where the employee has been performing labor. All payments shall be made
5 in the manner provided by law.

6 138. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of
7 failing to provide Aggrieved Employees who are terminated with their final paychecks at the place
8 of discharge and/or of failing to provide Aggrieved Employees with their final paychecks at the
9 office or agency of DEFENDANTS in the county where the work was performed, in violation of
10 Labor Code Section 208.

11 139. **Unlawful Agreements-Unlawful Criminal History Inquiries.**

12 Unlawful Agreements/ Unlawful Financial and Criminal Background Checks.

13 140. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
14 agree in writing to unlawful conditions of employment including but not limited to, unlawful non-
15 solicitation/non-compete agreements, unlawful confidentiality and/or nondisclosure agreements,
16 unlawful releases and/or waivers, including but not limited to, unlawful meal period waivers,
17 unlawful forum selection clauses and/or choice of law provisions/agreements and/or unlawful
18 criminal and/or financial checks as a condition of obtaining and/or continuing employment in
19 violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

20 141. Labor Code section 432.6(a), provides that “a person shall not, as a condition of
21 employment, continued employment, or the receipt of any employment-related benefit, require any
22 applicant for employment or any employee to waive any right...”

23 142. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
24 sign meal period waivers that were universally signed as a condition of employment, including but
25 not limited to, during the onboarding process. By requiring Aggrieved Employees to sign unlawful
26 meal period waivers as a condition of obtaining and/or maintaining employment, DEFENDANTS
27 violated Labor Code section 432.5. Further, these invalid waivers are otherwise unlawful under
28 Labor Code section 432.6. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS ordered unlawful

1 financial credit checks on Aggrieved Employees, in violation of Labor Code section 1024.5, and
2 required Aggrieved Employees to provide ongoing written consent to the unlawful credit checks as
3 a condition of employment, in violation of California and Federal law, which results in a further
4 violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

5 143. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also required Aggrieved
6 Employees to submit and/or agree to submit in writing to unlawful criminal background checks as
7 a condition of obtaining and/or holding employment in violation of the Investigative Consumer
8 Reporting Agencies Act (ICRAA- CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq.*) and the Fair Credit
9 Reporting Act (FCRA - 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.*). Based on information and belief,
10 DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to comply with the requirements of the ICRAA and
11 FCRA when conducting background screenings for applicants, including but not limited to
12 Aggrieved Employees that were subject to a background check as a condition of employment during
13 the application phase.

14 144. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
15 agree in writing to a background check which failed to abide by the requirements set forth in CA
16 Civil Code section 1786, *et seq.* and 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.*, including but not limited to by
17 failing to provide a clear and conspicuous disclosure and/or failing to provide any disclosure at all,
18 failing to provide disclosures free of extraneous information, failing to provide a lawful purpose for
19 the background check, failing to provide a summary of rights under the ICRAA and/or the FRCA,
20 failing to provide a way by which the individual could request a copy of the report, failing to disclose
21 the name, address, and telephone number of the third party preparing the report, and failing to
22 properly obtain authorization or consent to such a background check, and thus was an unlawful
23 background check.

24 145. By requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to unlawful criminal and/or
25 financial checks not in conformance with the applicable laws, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code
26 section 432.5.

27 146. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS also required Aggrieved
28 Employees to agree in writing to provide ongoing consent to DEFENDANTS to conduct

1 background checks throughout the duration of employment, in violation of the ICRAA and/or FCRA
2 and/or other applicable laws, resulting in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5, by
3 requiring applicants and employees to agree to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment.

4 147. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS knew that requiring
5 Aggrieved Employees to agree to unlawful criminal and/or financial background checks as a
6 condition of obtaining and/or holding employment was unlawful.

7 148. By requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to unlawful provisions as a
8 condition of employment, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5.

9 Unlawful Inquires into Criminal History

10 149. Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits an employer from asking applicants about past
11 arrest(s) unless they resulted in conviction(s) and even then, certain limitations apply. Based on
12 information and belief, DEFENDANTS asked Aggrieved Employees about arrests not resulting in
13 convictions on its employment application, in violation of California law.

14 150. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in violation of California law,
15 including but not limited to the Fair Chance Act/the California Fair Employment and Housing Act
16 (“FEHA”), asked Aggrieved Employees about convictions prior to extending an offer of
17 employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired into criminal history on its employment
18 application in violation of California law, and in violation of Labor code section 432.5.

19 Unlawful PAGA Waiver

20 151. Additionally, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5 by requiring
21 Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to other unlawful agreements, including but not limited
22 to, an unlawful waiver of PAGA and or representative actions as a condition of employment.

23 152. An action pursuant to PAGA “...is a representative action on behalf of the state”
24 *Kim v Reins Int’l California, Inc.*, (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87. It is well settled that agreements
25 purporting to waive an employee’s right to a trial of PAGA claims is contrary to California law and
26 unenforceable. See *Iskanian v CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal. 4th 348, 384
27 (“We conclude that where, as here, an employment agreement compels the waiver of representative
28 claims under the PAGA, it is contrary to public policy and unenforceable as a matter of state law.”)

1 153. Moreover, the California Supreme Court has ruled that a court cannot compel
2 arbitration of an aggrieved employee's individual PAGA claim because there is no such thing as an
3 individual PAGA claim. *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.*, (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87 ("There is
4 no individual component to a PAGA action because 'every PAGA action ... is a representative
5 action on behalf of the state.'")

6 154. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
7 agree in writing to waive their right to a trial of PAGA claims in violation of California law. By
8 requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to an unlawful PAGA waiver, DEFENDANTS
9 required written agreement to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment which is a
10 violation of labor code section 432.5.

11 155. **Violation of Labor Code Section 432.6.** Based on information and belief,
12 DEFENDANTS require/required Aggrieved Employees to waive their right to first and/or second
13 meal periods as a condition of working for DEFENDANTS in violation of California law. As such,
14 DEFENDANTS violated including but not limited to, Labor Code section 432.6 by virtue of
15 including but not limited to, requiring Aggrieved Employees to sign invalid meal period waivers as
16 a condition of employment and/or for threatening, retaliating and/or discriminating against and/or
17 terminating Aggrieved Employees because of their refusal to waive their meal period rights.

18 156. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and alleges thereon that DEFENDANTS
19 engaged in these same herein described unlawful practices, which led to violations of the California
20 Labor Code as further alleged below, and that DEFENDANTS applied these same herein described
21 unlawful practices to all of its employees that it applied to PLAINTIFF.

22
23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
24 **VIOLATION OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, LABOR CODE SECTIONS**
25 **2698, ET SEQ.**
26 **(On behalf of PLAINTIFF, Aggrieved Employees and the State of California against all**
27 **Defendants)**

28 157. PLAINTIFF incorporates all preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

Failure to Keep Accurate Records

158. California Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep "accurate and complete"

1 payroll records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by all non-exempt employees.
2 All applicable Wage Orders § 7 similarly requires employers to keep time records reflecting the
3 times during which all owed meal periods were provided each day.

4 159. At all relevant times, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to keep accurate
5 and complete records as required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total
6 daily hours worked, applicable rates of pay, time records showing when PLAINTIFF and other
7 Aggrieved Employees began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and
8 accurate itemized wage statements.

9 160. DEFENDANTS' failure to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records for
10 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees violates Labor Code §§ 1174, 1198, 1199, and all
11 applicable Wage Orders, section 7. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under
12 Labor Code §§ 558.1, 226.6, 1174.5 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and
13 Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each Aggrieved Employee for each pay
14 period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.²

15 **Meal Period Violations**

16 161. California law requires employers to provide employees a duty-free, uninterrupted
17 thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a workday, and
18 it must be provided within the first five (5) hours the employee works. Lab. Code section 512 (and
19 all applicable IWC Wage Orders), section 11(A) and (C); *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior*
20 *Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004.

21 162. Employers must also provide employees with a second duty-free, uninterrupted thirty
22 (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than (10) hours in a workday, and it must
23 be provided before the end of the 10th hour of work. *Ibid.*

24 163. Employers covered by any and all applicable IWC Wage Orders have an obligation

25 ² Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); Labor
26 Code § 558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
27 employee was underpaid"); All applicable wage orders, § 20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil
28 penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes
to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty...for each underpaid employee for each
pay period during which the employee was underpaid") (emphasis added).

1 to both (1) relieve their employees for at least one meal period for shifts over five hours (see above),
2 and (2) to record having done so. If the employer fails to properly record a valid meal period, it is
3 presumed that no meal period was provided. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7(A)(3)
4 (“Meal periods . . . shall also be recorded”); *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1052-1053, citing
5 section 7(A)(3) (“If an employer’s records show no meal period for a given shift over five hours, a
6 rebuttable presumption arises that the employee was not relieved of duty and no meal period was
7 provided”).

8 164. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employees’
9 regular rate of pay for each missed or unlawful meal period (e.g., less than 30 minutes, interrupted
10 meal period, first meal period provided after five (5) hours, second meal period provided after 10
11 hours). Lab. Code § 226.7; all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §11(B) (“If an employer fails to
12 provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provision of this Order, the
13 employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation
14 for each workday that the meal period is not provided”); *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4th 1004.

15 165. As explained above, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees were consistently
16 unable to take timely, off duty, thirty-minute, uninterrupted first and second meal periods, often
17 being forced to take late meal periods, interrupted meal periods, and/or work through part or all of
18 their meal periods due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or
19 commentary from supervisors pressuring them to take non-compliant meal periods or skip meal
20 periods completely.

21 166. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had and continue to have a policy
22 of rounding the start and end times of employees’ meal periods and/or automatically deducting thirty
23 minutes per shift despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and
24 Aggrieved Employees did not receive compliant meal periods.

25 167. Moreover, based on information and belief, Aggrieved Employees did not receive a
26 timely, uninterrupted second meal period when working shifts over ten (10) hours in a workday.

27 168. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DEFENDANTS had
28 actual and/or constructive knowledge that its time-rounding and auto-deduction policies and

1 practices, other unlawful policies and practices resulted in the denial of compliant meal periods in
2 violation of California's meal period laws.

3 169. DEFENDANTS also failed to pay premiums for missed/otherwise unlawful meal
4 periods in violation of California law and/or failed to pay the proper meal period premium for failure
5 to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration including but not limited to, bonuses, shift
6 differential pay and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate or compensation
7 for purposes of calculating the owed meal period premium.

8 170. These unlawful meal period policies and practices result in violations of Labor Code
9 sections 226.7, 512, and 1198-1199, and all applicable wage orders, § 11. These violations subject
10 DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code §§ 558, 558.1 and 2699, and all applicable
11 Wage Orders, § 20. These practices result in further violations such as violations of Labor Code §
12 1174 as discussed above, 1198-1199, 226.6 and other violations discussed below.

13 **Rest Period Violations**

14 171. Labor Code section 226.7 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders require an employer
15 to authorize or permit an employee to take a rest period of ten (10) net minutes for every four hours
16 worked or major fraction thereof. Such rest periods must be in the middle of the four-hour period
17 “insofar as practicable.” In *Brinker v. Restaurant Corp.*, 53 Cal.4th 1004 (2012),
18 the California Supreme Court held that employees are entitled to a 10-minute paid rest period for
19 shifts from 3 ½ to 6 hours in a length, two 10-minute rest periods for shifts more than 6 hours up to
20 10 hours, and three 10-minute rest periods for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours. (*Id.* at
21 1029). The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take
22 off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control
23 over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th
24 257. If the employer fails to provide any required rest period, the employer must pay the employee
25 one hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday the employer did
26 not provide at least one legally required rest period, pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, and
27 applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(B).

28 172. Moreover, under California law rest periods must be a “net” ten minutes in a suitable
36
PLAINTIFF’S REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT

1 rest area. *Id.* at 268 (relying on January 3, 1986 and February 22, 2002 Division of Labor Standards
2 Enforcement (DLSE) Letters wherein the DLSE ruled that the net ten-minute language for rest
3 periods means ten minutes of time in a rest area and cannot include time it takes to get to and from
4 the rest area). The employer must show that it clearly articulates the right to a net ten minutes,
5 which means it must clearly communicate what “net” ten minutes means (i.e., regardless of what
6 happens along the way to and from a rest area, employees are entitled to a full ten minutes of rest in
7 the rest area). *Id.*; see also, *Bufile v. Dollar Fin. Grp., Inc.*, (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1199 (the
8 “onus is on the employer to clearly communicate the authorization and permission [to take rest
9 periods] to its employees.”).

10 173. PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive legally compliant, timely
11 10-minute rest periods for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. As explained
12 above, any purported rest periods were late, interrupted, cut short, on duty, and/or otherwise subject
13 to DEFENDANTS’ control due to the nature and constraints of Aggrieved Employees’ job duties,
14 understaffing, and/or commentary from supervisors pressuring PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved
15 Employees to skip rest periods completely or otherwise take non-compliant rest periods.

16 174. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or
17 practices that failed to relieve PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees of all duties and
18 employer control during rest periods. Based on further information and belief, Aggrieved
19 Employees were pressured to complete their work duties according to a designated schedule such
20 that rest periods were only taken once tasks were completed, and/or as time permitted.

21 175. As a result, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees did not receive legally compliant
22 first, second, or third rest periods as required by California law.

23 176. Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay a rest
24 period premium to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees for each workday in which there
25 was a missed or otherwise unlawful rest period. Based on further information and belief, when a
26 rest premium was paid, DEFENDANTS failed to include non-discretionary compensation including
27 but not limited to, bonuses, shift differential pay, and/or other non-discretionary compensation into
28 the regular rate of compensation for purposes of determining the owed rest period premium.

1 177. As such, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198-1199, and
2 all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties
3 under Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699, and all applicable Wage Orders, §20.

4 **Failure to Provide Suitable Resting Facilities**

5 178. Per section 13 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with
6 suitable resting facilities. Section 13(B) of the Wage Orders provides: “Suitable resting facilities
7 shall be provided in an area separate from the toilet rooms and shall be available to employees during
8 work hours.”

9 179. DEFENDANTS’ locations/facilities are generally similar in layout and design, and
10 there was, and continues to be, space that allows for a resting facility that employees may use to
11 cease work and recover during meal or rest periods. DEFENDANTS could have provided Aggrieved
12 Employees with a resting facility within DEFENDANTS’ facilities/locations with reasonable or no
13 modification, but instead denied and continues to deny, employees with suitable areas to rest (e.g. a
14 breakroom). As a result, Aggrieved Employees were forced to adjust to areas not conducive to
15 resting, including but not limited to leaning up against the wall, or search for facilities outside of
16 DEFENDANTS’ premises which are not designated or reserved for their rest, such as their personal
17 vehicles.

18 180. DEFENDANTS did not provide Aggrieved Employees with suitable resting facilities
19 during their hours of work, particularly during meal and/or rest periods.

20 181. DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide suitable resting facilities to Aggrieved
21 Employees violated and continue to violate the applicable Wage Order, section 13(B) and the
22 California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

23 **Minimum and Overtime Wage Violations**

24 182. California law provides that employees in California must be paid for all hours
25 worked, up to forty (40) hour per week or eight (8) hours per day, at a regular rate that is no less
26 than the mandated minimum wage. *See* Labor Code section 1197 and the applicable Wage Order.
27 The minimum wage standard applies to each hour employees worked for which they were not paid.
28 Therefore, an employer’s failure to pay for any particular hour worked by an employee is unlawful

1 even if averaging an employee's total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average
2 hourly wage above minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324.

3 183. California law also provides that employees in California must be paid overtime,
4 equal to 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours per
5 week or 8 hours per day. *See* Labor Code 510 and the applicable Wage Order section 3. Employers
6 must pay overtime equal to double the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond
7 twelve (12) hours per workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh
8 consecutive day of work in a work week. *Ibid.*

9 184. As explained above, DEFENDANTS violated California's minimum and overtime
10 wage laws by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked
11 by virtue of, among other things, DEFENDANTS' time rounding policies and practices (for shift
12 start and end times and meal period start and end times), payment according to scheduled hours
13 worked, automatic deduction for meal periods, and/or off-the-clock/unpaid work completed during
14 meal periods, and/or other otherwise off-the-clock work (described above), and/or other unlawful
15 policies and/or practices described above which resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages.

16 185. DEFENDANTS had and continue to have a policy of failing to pay PLAINTIFF and
17 Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked.

18 186. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual or constructive
19 knowledge that its time-rounding policies and practices, auto-deduction policies and practices for
20 meal periods, payment according to scheduled hours, failure to relieve employees of all duties and
21 employer control during unpaid meal periods, and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in the
22 underpayment of minimum and overtime wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
23 Employees.

24 187. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay twice Aggrieved
25 Employees' regular rate(s) of pay for time worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for
26 time worked beyond eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week, in
27 violation of California's overtime laws.

28 188. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further violated California's
39
PLAINTIFF'S REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT

1 overtime wage laws by failing to incorporate all non-discretionary compensation, including but not
2 limited to, non-discretionary bonus compensation, shift differentials, and/or other non-discretionary
3 compensation into the regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate of pay. Failing to
4 include non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of pay resulted in a miscalculation of
5 the overtime wage rate, resulting in the underpayment of overtime wages owed to PLAINTIFF and
6 other Aggrieved Employees.

7 189. This conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 218.5, 510, 558, 558.1,
8 1194, 1197, 1198-1199, and all applicable Wage Orders. These violations subject DEFENDANTS
9 to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 218.5, 558, 558.1, 1197.1, 2699, and all applicable IWC
10 Wage Orders, section 20.

11 **Failure to Provide Written Commission Agreements**

12 190. Labor Code section 2751 requires that all commission contracts "be in writing and .
13 . . set forth the method by which the commissions shall be computed and paid." Cal. Lab. Code
14 section 2751(a) (2012). Under the statute, employers must also "give a signed copy of the contract
15 to every employee who is a party [to the contract] and . . . obtain a signed receipt for the contract
16 from each employee." *Id.* section 2751(b).

17 191. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Aggrieved
18 Employees who were compensated on a commission basis with proper written commission
19 agreements, in violation of Labor Code section 2751.

20 **Violation of Labor Code Section 226.2**

21 192. Labor Code section 226.2 requires an employer to pay employees compensated on a
22 piece-rate basis separately for rest and recovery periods and nonproductive time, apart from any
23 piece-rate pay. This statute further requires an employer to include on the wage statements for these
24 employees the total hours of compensable rest and recovery period, the total hours for other non-
25 productive time, the rates of compensation for these hours, and the gross wages paid for these hours.
26 In addition, the statute requires that employees shall be compensated for rest and recovery periods at
27 a regular hourly rate that is no less than the higher of: (i) an average hourly rate determined by
28 dividing the total compensation for the workweek, exclusive of compensation for rest and recovery

1 periods and any premium compensation for overtime, by the total hours worked during the
2 workweek, exclusive of rest and recovery periods, or (ii) The applicable minimum wage. Per case
3 law, Labor Code section 226.2 also applies to employees compensated on a commission basis.

4 193. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate Aggrieved
5 Employees who were paid solely on a piece rate and/or commission basis separately for the rest
6 periods and nonproductive time, and/or failed to pay them for this time at the correct rates. Based
7 on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed to include this information on Aggrieved
8 Employees' wage statements. As such, DEFENDANTS failed to comply with Labor Code section
9 226.2.

10 **Statutory Wage Violations**

11 194. California Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for an employer to secretly pay
12 wages lower than required by statute while purporting to pay legal wages. As described above,
13 DEFENDANTS willfully and systematically denied PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees of all
14 earned minimum and overtime compensation for all hours worked which resulted in the payment of
15 less than statutorily required wages. DEFENDANTS acted with the intent to deprive them of
16 statutory wages, including, but not limited to, minimum and overtime wages, to which they were
17 entitled to under California law. Thus, DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
18 Employees lower wages than those they were entitled to while purporting that PLAINTIFF and
19 other Aggrieved Employees were properly paid. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
20 Employees are entitled to recover penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to
21 Labor Code § 2699(f)-(g).

22 **Refusal to Make Payment**

23 195. Labor Code section 216 declares unlawful an employer's refusal to pay wages due
24 and payable and/or the denial of the validity of any claim to wages due. DEFENDANTS violated
25 and continue to violate this section by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees for all
26 hours worked at the proper wage rate and by failing to pay an additional hour of pay for each
27 meal/rest period not provided or that was otherwise unlawful. *Gould v. Maryland Sound Industries,*
28 *Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1154-1155. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil

1 penalties under Labor Code section 225.5. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for
2 each Aggrieved Employee, for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.³

3 **Standard Conditions of Labor Violations**

4 196. Together, Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199 make unlawful any employment of
5 any employee under conditions of labor prohibited by the Wage Orders, and any violation, refusal,
6 or neglect to comply with any provision within Part 4, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code, including
7 sections 1174, 1197, and 1198, or order or ruling of the commission. Therefore, DEFENDANTS'
8 violations with respect to meal periods, rest periods, record keeping provisions, business expenses,
9 minimum/overtime wages and other violations described herein result in separate violations of
10 sections 1198 and 1199, which subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections
11 1197.1 and 2699.

12 **Business Expense Violations**

13 197. California law requires employers to indemnify their employees for all necessary
14 expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of
15 their obedience to the directions of the employer. *See* Cal. Lab. Code s. 2802 and all applicable
16 Wage Orders section 9(b). Furthermore, "for purposes of [section 2802], the term 'necessary
17 expenditure or losses' shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees
18 incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section."

19 198. Among other things, under California law, when employees must use their personal
20 cellphones for work-related purposes, the employer must reimburse them for a reasonable
21 percentage of their cell phone bills. *See Cochran v. Schwan's Home Services, Inc.* (2014) 228
22 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140. To show liability, an employee will only need to show that he or she was
23 required to use their personal cellphone for work-related purposes and not reimbursed for the use.
24 *Id.* 1144-1145. California law also requires employers to reimburse employees for automobile
25 expenses incurred for the business use of personal vehicles, such as for mileage, gas, and the wear

26
27 ³ Labor Code § 225.5 (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty
28 provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in violation of sections 212,
216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty...for each failure to pay each employee") (emphasis added).

1 and tear on the vehicle. *See Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 554.

2 199. Further, “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to
3 waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive
4 any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled to under
5 the laws of this State.” *See* Cal. Lab. Code section 2804.

6 200. As described above, PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees were improperly
7 required to pay for business expenses that are legally the responsibility of the employer.

8 201. DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees with
9 full reimbursement for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required
10 that PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees subsidize and/or carry the burden of business
11 expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

12 202. As a result of DEFENDANTS’ unlawful conduct, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
13 Employees have suffered injury in that they were not completely reimbursed as mandated by
14 California law.

15 203. DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees with
16 full reimbursement for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required
17 that PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved Employees subsidize and/or carry the burden of business
18 expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

19 204. As a result of DEFENDANTS’ unlawful conduct, PLAINTIFF and the Aggrieved
20 Employees have suffered injury in that they were not completely reimbursed as mandated by
21 California law.

22 205. Despite being aware of these business expenses, DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse
23 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees for such expenses in violation of California Labor
24 Code § 2802. In turn, there constitutes a PAGA violation based on violations of California Labor
25 Code § 2802 and the applicable Wage Order.

26 **Wage Statement Violations**

27 206. California law requires every employer semi-monthly or at the time of each payment
28 of wages to furnish its employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing that contains

1 the following: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of
2 piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;
3 (4) all deductions; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee
4 is paid; (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number
5 or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address
6 of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
7 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Lab. Code § 226.

8 207. As DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees
9 with meal and rest periods that complied with Labor Code section 226.7, the wage statements
10 DEFENDANTS issued to PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees failed and continue to fail
11 to correctly set forth (a) the gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1); (b)
12 the total hours worked by the employee in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2); (c) the net
13 wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(5); and (d) all applicable hourly rates in
14 effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by
15 the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

16 208. Moreover, due to violations detailed above, including but not limited to,
17 DEFENDANTS' failure to pay regular and overtime wages for all hours worked, failure to provide
18 meal and rest break premiums, and failure to pay all sick leave wages at the proper rates,
19 DEFENDANTS have violated California Labor Code § 226 by willfully failing to furnish
20 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements that listed
21 the gross and net wages earned and the correct applicable rates of pay for all hours worked. Based
22 on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all forms of non-discretionary
23 compensation earned during the pay period into the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating
24 the owed overtime rate, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour of
25 overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees.

26 209. As explained above, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list the
27 "total hours worked" by PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees (by virtue of rounded time entries,
28 automatic deduction for meal periods/failure to relieve Aggrieved Employees of all duties and

1 employer control during unpaid meal periods, and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices
2 described above), which results in a violation of Labor Code section 226(a). Failure to list all hours
3 worked on a wage statement, gives rise to an inference of injury under Labor Code Section 226
4 (*Maldonado v. Epsilon Plastics, Inc.*, (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 1308, 1337).

5 210. Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed
6 to list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
7 hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of, including but not limited to, Labor
8 Code section 226(a)(9).

9 211. Separately, and independent from the above allegations, based on information and
10 belief, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees that
11 violate Labor Code section 226(a)(8), by failing to list the correct name and/or address of the legal
12 entity that is the employer.

13 212. Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed
14 to list the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the Aggrieved Employee is being paid.

15 213. DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately list all hours worked on all wage statements
16 caused confusion to PLAINTIFF and caused and continues to cause confusion to other Aggrieved
17 Employees over whether they received all wages owed to them.

18 214. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury as
19 they could not easily determine whether they received all wages owed to them and whether they
20 were paid for all hours worked.

21 215. Moreover, as a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to list the correct name and/or
22 address of the legal entity that is the employer, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees have suffered
23 injury as they could not contact their employer regarding any question(s) they had about wages paid.

24 216. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
25 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements.

26 217. As a result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful conduct, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved
27 Employees have suffered injury. The absence of accurate information on their wage statements has
28 prevented earlier challenges to DEFENDANTS' unlawful pay practices, will require discovery and

1 mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed, and will cause difficulty and
2 expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records. DEFENDANTS' conduct led to the
3 submission of inaccurate information about wages and amounts deducted from wages to state and
4 federal government agencies. As a result, PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees are required to
5 participate in this lawsuit and create more difficulty and expense from having to reconstruct time
6 and pay records than if DEFENDANT had complied with its legal obligations.

7 218. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.
8 Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each Aggrieved Employee, for each pay period
9 during which the statute provisions were violated. ⁴

10 **Unlawful Deductions**

11 219. Labor Code section 221 prohibits an employer from “collect[ing] or receiv[ing] from
12 an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee.” Based on
13 information and belief DEFENDANTS made unlawful deductions from Aggrieved Employees
14 paychecks during the relevant period. Such a practice is in violation of including but not limited to,
15 Labor Code Sections 221-222 which subjects DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code
16 Section 2699.

17 220. Each violation results in a separate civil penalty, for each Aggrieved Employee, for
18 each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated. See Lab. Code §225.5
19 (establishing that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty
20 provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in
21 violation of Section 212, 216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty...for each failure
22 to pay each employee”).

23 **Reporting Time Pay Violations**

24 221. Section 5 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, provides as follows:

25 222. (A) Each workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is
26 not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the
27 employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two

28 ⁴ Labor Code § 226.3 (establishing that the civil penalty is ~~40~~ per employee per violation”).

1 (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less
2 than the minimum wage. (B) If an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one
3 workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting said employee
4 shall be paid for two hours at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the
5 minimum wage.

6 223. Aggrieved Employees were not paid reporting time wages in accordance with
7 California law, including but not limited to the applicable IWC Wage Order. For example, based on
8 information and belief, at times, PLAINTIFF and/or other Aggrieved Employees reported to work
9 for a scheduled shift but were sent home and/or were not put to work and were not paid all owed
10 reporting time pay wages in accordance with California law.

11 224. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of
12 failing to pay all reporting time wages to Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California law,
13 including but not limited to, the applicable IWC Wage Order, Section 5. DEFENDANTS' failure to
14 pay all reporting time wages to Aggrieved Employees violated and continues to violate the
15 applicable Wage Order, and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

16 **Violation of California Day of Rest Law**

17 225. Under California law, every employee in California is "entitled" to "one day's rest
18 [from labor] in seven"; and, no employer may "cause" its employees "to work more than six days in
19 seven." See Labor Code Sections 551 and 552. Labor Code section 553 provides that a violation of
20 the foregoing sections is a misdemeanor.

21 226. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have and continue to have a
22 uniform policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to work at least seven days
23 consecutively in a workweek, in violation of including but not limited to, Labor Code Section
24 551. Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and/or other Aggrieved Employees were
25 suffered, permitted, or required to work at least seven (7) days consecutively in a workweek, in
26 violation of California law, including but not limited to Labor Code Section 551.

27 **Seating Violations**

28 227. Per section 14(A-B) of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be
47
PLAINTIFF'S REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT

1 provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats and
2 when they are not actively engaged in the work duties that would not permit them to be seated.

3 228. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, Section 14(A-B) provides:

4 (A) All working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the
5 work reasonably permits the use of seats.

6 (B) When employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the
7 nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in
8 reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it
9 does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

10 229. Suitable seating is one of the worker protections covered by California's Wage
11 Orders, which have the same dignity as statutes, are remedial in nature and are to be broadly
12 construed to effectuate the goal of protecting the comfort and welfare of employees. *Brinker*
13 *Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1027 (2012).

14 230. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Aggrieved
15 Employees with suitable seating, and when such employees were not engaged in duties which
16 required them to stand, no seating was placed in reasonable proximity to their workstations.

17 231. Moreover, based on information and belief, the nature of the work reasonably
18 permitted the use of seats for at least part of the time that Aggrieved Employees were working.
19 Lastly, there were periods of time when Aggrieved Employees were not engaged in active duties of
20 their employment, yet there were no suitable seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and use
21 of seats would not interfere with the performance of their duties.

22 232. The Aggrieved Employees worked in various positions. The nature of Aggrieved
23 Employees' work reasonably permitted the use of seats. However, DEFENDANTS failed to provide
24 suitable seating in reasonable proximity to Aggrieved Employees' work areas in violation of section
25 14(A-B) of all applicable Wage Orders, and Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199, subjecting
26 DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1199 and 2699. Each violation of each
27 Labor Code section and IWC Wage Order provision, for each Aggrieved Employee, results in a
28 separate civil penalty.

1 **Sick Leave Violations**

2 233. DEFENDANTS violated California's paid sick leave laws including, Labor Code
3 section 245-248.5 and 233-234. DEFENDANTS either failed to provide sick leave pay to
4 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees or failed to properly accrue paid sick leave due to
5 DEFENDANTS' failure to account for actual hours worked (as explained above), and/or failure to
6 incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all forms of non-discretionary remuneration including but
7 not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses, shift differential pay, and/or other non-discretionary
8 compensation into the sick leave pay rate calculation.

9 234. DEFENDANTS further failed to give PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees
10 notice of their paid sick leave rights – or thereby putting their entitlement to sick leave in a Labor
11 Code section 2810.5 notice. In addition, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain accurate records of used
12 sick leave and the balance of paid sick leave left to the employees, which affected PLAINTIFF and
13 Aggrieved Employees' intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave.

14 235. But for this failure, PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees would have used
15 their paid sick leave at least prior to their respective separations, for as on several occasions
16 thereafter, he or she would have been entitled to use the banked sick leave and earn appropriate
17 compensation.

18 236. In violation of Labor Code section 247.5, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain records
19 documenting the hours worked and paid sick days accrued and used by PLAINTIFF and all
20 Aggrieved Employees, permitting the presumption that PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved Employees
21 were entitled to the maximum number of hours accruable.

22 237. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to comply
23 with Labor Code section 246, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved Employees with
24 a Labor Code section 226 wage statement, or separate writing containing the amount of paid sick
25 leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays
26 wages.

27 238. These practices violated California's sick leave laws, Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*

28 239. On information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges that all of these practices were

1 experienced and continue to be experienced by other Aggrieved Employees.

2 240. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks all appropriate relief under the PAGA, the
3 aforementioned code provisions including but not limited to Labor Code section 233 and 234, and
4 seeks injunctive relief, attorney's fees, declaratory relief, and penalties as permitted by law.

5 **Failure To Provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave**

6 241. Labor Code § 248.2 provides that all employers with 26 or more employees are
7 required to provide up to 80 hours for covered employees to take 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental
8 Paid Sick Leave to care for themselves, to care for a family member or if it is vaccine-related.
9 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 248.2 by not providing PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved
10 Employees with required 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave. Based on information
11 and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave in 2022 in violation of
12 Labor Code section 248.6.

13 **Failure to Pay Vested Vacation/Paid Time Off**

14 242. California Labor Code section 227.3 provides that when an employer policy provides
15 for paid vacations and/or paid time off, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his,
16 her, or their vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to the employee as wages at the
17 employee's final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting
18 eligibility or time served and that there shall be no forfeiture of vested vacation time or paid time
19 off upon termination.

20 243. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had and continue to have a
21 uniform policy and practice of failing to allow Aggrieved Employees to use their earned
22 vacation/paid time off during their employment and failing to pay all vested, accrued paid time off
23 to Aggrieved Employees upon separation of employment, in violation of California law, including
24 but not limited to, Labor Code section 227.3.

25 **Untimely Payment of Final Wages**

26 244. California Labor Code section 201(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an
27 employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and
28 payable immediately." California Labor Code section 202(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an

1 employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her
2 wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has
3 given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled
4 to his or her wages at the time of quitting.”

5 245. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, an employer that willfully fails to pay wages
6 due an employee who is terminated or resigns must pay (in addition to the unpaid wages) a penalty
7 equal to the employee's daily wages for each day, not exceeding 30 days, that the wages are unpaid.
8 Case law clarifies this 30-day waiting time penalty is recoverable under the PAGA via Labor Code
9 section 256. See, *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014); see also,
10 *Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 134 Cal. App. 4th 365 (2005).

11 246. Based in information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to timely
12 pay final wages to PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees upon separation of employment in
13 violation of Labor Code section 201-202. Moreover, final paychecks once provided to PLAINTIFF
14 and Aggrieved Employees did not include all wages owed as they are devoid of, including but not
15 limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, and all owed
16 sick leave and/or paid time off wages at the properly accrued rates.

17 247. As a result, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. These
18 violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 203, 210, and/or
19 256.

20 **Unlawful Agreements/ Unlawful Criminal History Inquiries**

21 248. *Unlawful Agreements.* Labor Code section 432.5 provides that “no employer...shall
22 require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition
23 which is known by such employer...to be prohibited by law.” DEFENDANTS required and
24 continue to require PLAINTIFF and Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to unlawful
25 conditions of employment including but not limited to, unlawful non-solicitation/non-compete
26 agreements, unlawful confidentiality and/or nondisclosure agreements, unlawful releases and/or
27 waivers, including but not limited to, unlawful meal period waivers, unlawful forum selection
28 clauses and/or choice of law provisions/agreements and/or unlawful criminal and/or financial

1 checks as a condition of obtaining and/or continuing employment in violation of Labor Code section
2 432.5.

3 249. Labor Code section 432.6(a), provides that “a person shall not, as a condition of
4 employment, continued employment, or the receipt of any employment-related benefit, require any
5 applicant for employment or any employee to waive any right...”

6 250. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
7 sign meal period waivers that were universally signed as a condition of employment, including but
8 not limited to, during the onboarding process. By requiring Aggrieved Employees to sign unlawful
9 meal period waivers as a condition of obtaining and/or maintaining employment, DEFENDANTS
10 violated Labor Code section 432.5. Further, these invalid waivers are otherwise unlawful under
11 Labor Code section 432.6. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS ordered unlawful
12 financial credit checks on Aggrieved Employees, in violation of Labor Code section 1024.5, and
13 required Aggrieved Employees to provide ongoing written consent to the unlawful credit checks as
14 a condition of employment, in violation of California and Federal law, which results in a further
15 violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

16 251. The California Labor Code places certain procedural and substantive limits on an
17 employers’ ability to conduct employee background checks and on how employers can use the
18 information they obtain through those background checks. Labor Code section 1024.5 states that
19 employers, except for financial institutions, may order a credit check only if the individual works
20 (or is applying to work) in certain positions (e.g., managerial positions, financially-related positions,
21 and certain government positions). Additionally, the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies
22 Act (ICRAA- CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq.*) and the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA - 15
23 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.*) mandate several requirements prior to and following an employee
24 background check, including but not limited to identifying an appropriate reason for the background
25 check, a separate consent form with required disclosures and certain formatting requirements,
26 additional forms such as a summary of rights, a way by which to request a copy of the report, as
27 well as proper notice of adverse actions taken, among other statutory requirements.

28 252. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS ordered unlawful financial credit

1 checks on Aggrieved Employees, in violation of Labor Code section 1024.5, and required them to
2 provide ongoing written consent to the unlawful credit checks as a condition of employment, in
3 violation of California and Federal law, which results in a violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

4 253. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
5 submit and/or agree to submit in writing to unlawful criminal background checks as a condition of
6 obtaining and/or holding employment in violation of the ICRAA and the FCRA as alleged above.

7 254. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved
8 Employees to agree in writing to provide DEFENDANTS with ongoing consent to conduct
9 background checks throughout the duration of employment, in violation of the ICRAA and/or FCRA
10 and/or other applicable laws, resulting in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5, by
11 requiring applicants and employees to agree to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment.

12 255. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS knew that requiring
13 Aggrieved Employees to agree to unlawful criminal and/or financial background checks as a
14 condition of obtaining and/or holding employment was unlawful.

15 256. By requiring that Aggrieved Employees sign off on the illegal background and/or
16 financial checks, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5.

17 Unlawful Inquires into Criminal History

18 257. Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits an employer from asking applicants about past
19 arrest(s) unless they resulted in conviction(s) and even then, certain limitations apply. Based on
20 information and belief, DEFENDANTS asked Aggrieved Employees about arrests not resulting in
21 convictions on its employment application, in violation of California law.

22 258. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in violation of California law,
23 including but not limited to the Fair Chance Act/the California Fair Employment and Housing Act
24 (“FEHA”), asked Aggrieved Employees about convictions prior to extending an offer of
25 employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired into criminal history on its employment
26 application in violation of California law.

27 259. By asking about arrests not resulting in convictions, DEFENDANTS violated Labor
28 Code section 432.7. By asking about convictions at the application phase or prior to extending an

1 employment offer, DEFENDANTS violated California's Fair Chance Act, and thereby violated
2 Labor Code section 432.5 by unlawfully requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to
3 disclose arrests and/or convictions as a condition of employment.

4 Unlawful PAGA Waiver

5 260. Additionally, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5 by requiring
6 PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to other unlawful agreements,
7 including but not limited to, an unlawful waiver of PAGA and/or representative actions as a
8 condition of employment.

9 261. An action pursuant to PAGA "...is a representative action on behalf of the state"
10 *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.*, (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87. It is well settled that agreements
11 purporting to waive an employee's right to a trial of PAGA claims is contrary to California law and
12 unenforceable. See *Iskanian v CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal. 4th 348, 384
13 ("We conclude that where, as here, an employment agreement compels the waiver of representative
14 claims under the PAGA, it is contrary to public policy and unenforceable as a matter of state law.")

15 262. Moreover, the California Supreme Court has ruled that a court cannot compel
16 arbitration of an aggrieved employee's individual PAGA claim because there is no such thing as an
17 individual PAGA claim. *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.*, (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87 ("There is
18 no individual component to a PAGA action because 'every PAGA action ... is a representative
19 action on behalf of the state.'")

20 263. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
21 agree in writing to waive their right to a trial of PAGA claims in violation of California law. By
22 requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to an unlawful PAGA waiver, DEFENDANTS
23 required written agreement to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment which is a
24 violation of labor code section 432.5.

25 Violation of Labor Code Section 432.6

26 264. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required Aggrieved Employees to
27 sign meal period waivers that were universally signed as a condition of employment, including but
28 not limited to, during the onboarding process. Further, these invalid waivers are otherwise unlawful

1 under Labor Code section 432.6.

2 265. Labor Code Section 432.6(a) provides: “[A] person shall not, as a condition of
3 employment, continued employment, or the receipt of any employment-related benefit, require any
4 applicant for employment or any employee to waive any right...”

5 266. Labor Code Section 432.6(b) provides in pertinent part:

6 267. “An employer shall not threaten, retaliate, or discriminate against, or terminate any
7 applicant for employment or any employee because of the refusal to the waiver of any right...”

8 268. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS require/required Aggrieved
9 Employees to waive their right to first and/or second meal periods as a condition of working for
10 DEFENDANTS in violation of California law. As such, DEFENDANTS violated including but not
11 limited to, Labor Code section 432.6 by virtue of including but not limited to, requiring Aggrieved
12 Employees to sign invalid meal period waivers as a condition of employment and/or for threatening,
13 retaliating and/or discriminating against and/or terminating Aggrieved Employees because of their
14 refusal to waive their meal period rights.

15 269. Under the provisions of PAGA and the above mentioned Labor Code sections,
16 including but not limited to Labor Code sections 201-203, 208, 210, 216, 221-223, 225.5, 226,
17 226.7, 245-248.6, 256, 432, 432.5, 432.6, 432.7, 510, 512, 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1194,
18 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2699, 2699.3, 2802, 2810.5 and all applicable Wage Orders as
19 well as all interpretations of these laws by California Courts and administrative bodies, as well as
20 any other law that is enforceable through PAGA, DEFENDANTS are liable for the following
21 penalties:

- 22 a. All statutorily-specified penalties recoverable under PAGA as enumerated in the
23 relevant California Labor Code provisions listed herein only if permitted by the
24 PAGA statute, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a); and
- 25 b. Default PAGA penalties for any violation of the enumerated list of Labor Code
26 violations without a civil penalty recoverable under the PAGA, all in the default
27 amounts provided by Labor Code section 2699(f).
- 28 c. The proper measure of penalties under PAGA is the number of violations,

1 whether those violations were committed as against PLAINTIFF or any
2 Aggrieved Employee, whether a party to this action or not.

3 270. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g), and/or any and all other applicable laws,
4 PLAINTIFF is entitled to recover civil penalties, costs, and attorney's fees.

5 ///

6 ///

7 ///

8 ///

9 ///

10 ///

11 ///

12 ///

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for relief and judgment as follows on behalf of
3 PLAINTIFF, the State of California, and all Aggrieved Employees:

- 4 1. For civil penalties under Labor Code Section 2699 (75% payable to the
5 LWDA and 25% payable to Aggrieved Employees);
- 6 2. For an order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and
7 restraining DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set
8 forth herein;
- 9 3. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and
- 10 4. For such other and further relief that the Court deems just and proper.
- 11

12 Dated: January 23, 2024

CROSNER LEGAL, PC

13
14 By: _____



15 Jamie K. Serb, Esq.
16 Brandon Brouillette, Esq.
17 Zachary M. Crosner, Esq.
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff
19 JOHN MARTELL
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28