

Daniel J. Hyun (State Bar No. 309184)
daniel@torusllp.com
 David Alami (State Bar No. 314628)
david@torusllp.com
TORUS LLP
 1440 N. Harbor Blvd., Ste. 900
 Fullerton, California 92835
 Telephone: (949) 590-4122
 Facsimile: (949) 528-2596

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jorge Fonseca

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles
01/23/2024

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: R. Lozano Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JORGE FONSECA, an individual, on behalf of
 himself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BLUE RIVER FOODS, INC.; AD FOODS,
 INC.; D & G PROCESSING, INC.; and DOES 1
 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23STCV28321

Assigned for all purposes to:
 Hon. David S. Cunningham III, Dept. 11

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Pay All Wages;
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Compensation;
3. Failure to Permit Rest Periods or Provide Compensation;
4. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
5. Waiting Time Penalties;
6. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
7. Violation of the Unfair Competition Law; and
8. Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004

Action Filed: November 17, 2023
 Trial Date: None Set

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff JORGE FONSECA (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of all others similarly
2 situated, brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against
3 Defendants BLUE RIVER FOODS, INC., AD FOODS, INC., D & G PROCESSING, INC.; and
4 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), and alleges as follows:

5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. Plaintiff brings this putative class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section
7 382 against Defendants, on behalf of all current and former non-exempt employees employed by
8 Defendants in California during the Class Period (collectively the “Class” or “Class Members”). The
9 term Class Period is defined as four (4) years and 178 days prior to the filing of this action to the date
10 of class certification, which includes the period of time in which the applicable statutes of limitation
11 were tolled between April 6, 2020 and October 1, 2020, pursuant to the California Rules of Court,
12 Appendix I, Emergency Rule 9.

13 2. Plaintiff also brings this representative action pursuant to the PAGA, Labor Code
14 sections 2698 *et seq.*, against Defendants, on behalf of himself individually and other aggrieved
15 employees who are and were employed by Defendants throughout California during the PAGA Period.
16 The term PAGA Period is defined as one (1) year prior to Plaintiff’s notice of labor code violations to
17 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants until judgment.

18 3. Defendants own and operate a poultry processing company in California including Los
19 Angeles County.

20 4. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have engaged in a systematic pattern of wage and hour
21 violations under the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage
22 Orders, and California Business and Professions Code that have damaged Plaintiff and Class
23 Members, and contribute to Defendants’ deliberate unfair competition.

24 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have violated
25 and continue to violate state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 26 (a) failing to pay all wages (including sick pay and minimum, regular, and overtime wages)
27 including wages at the proper rate of pay for overtime, meal and rest period premiums,
28 and sick pay;

- (b) unlawfully deducting wages;
- (c) failing to provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- (d) failing to authorize or permit rest breaks or provide compensation in lieu thereof;
- (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
- (f) failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment; and
- (g) failing to reimburse business expenses.

6. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of himself and the putative class to recover, among other things, unpaid wages, liquidated damages, restitution, interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and penalties pursuant to Labor Code Sections 201-204, 206, 210, 218.6, 221, 222, 223, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 246.5, 248.5, 256, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*, 2699.3, 2699.5, 2800, and 2802, and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This is a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 and representative action pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2698 *et. seq.* ("PAGA"). The monetary damages, restitution, penalties, and other amounts sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

8. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes, except those given by statutes to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

9. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, they have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

10. Venue is proper in this Court under Code of Civil Procedure Sections 395(a) and 395.5 because, upon information and belief, Defendants reside, transact business, maintain offices, and/or

1 have an agent or agents in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this
2 county.

3 **PARTIES**

4 11. Plaintiff is a California citizen. Defendants employ Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee
5 and employed Plaintiff during the Class Period. Plaintiff's job duties consist of, *inter alia*, emptying
6 boxes of chicken, removing bones from chicken legs, and filling and emptying boxes with chicken
7 bones. Plaintiff's employment with Defendants ended within one (1) year of the filing of this action.

8 12. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
9 AD Foods, Inc. ("ADF") was and is a poultry processing company that employed Plaintiff and the
10 Class Members during the Class Period. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that ADF's
11 principal place of business is located at 1877 Penn Mar Avenue, South El Monte, California 91733.
12 Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, ADF regularly
13 conducted and conducts business within the State of California and derives substantial revenues from
14 services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant
15 times, ADF was and is an employer subject to California state wage and hour laws.

16 13. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
17 Blue River Foods, Inc. ("BRF") was and is a poultry processing company that employed Plaintiff and
18 the Class Members during the Class Period. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that
19 BRF's principal place of business is located at 1877 Penn Mar Avenue, South El Monte, California
20 91733. Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, BRF
21 regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of California and derives substantial
22 revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges
23 that, at all relevant times, BRF was and is an employer subject to California state wage and hour laws.

24 14. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times Defendant
25 D & G Processing, Inc. ("D & G") was and is a poultry processing company that employed Plaintiff
26 and the Class Members during the Class Period. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that
27 D & G's principal place of business is located at 1877 Penn Mar Avenue, South El Monte, California
28 91733. Plaintiff is further informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, D & G

1 regularly conducted and conducts business within the State of California and derives substantial
2 revenues from services performed in California. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges
3 that, at all relevant times, D & G was and is an employer subject to California state wage and hour
4 laws.

5 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all times hereinafter
6 mentioned, Defendants were and are subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders as employers,
7 whose employees were and are engaged throughout this county and the State of California.

8 16. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

9 17. Defendant DOES 1 through 50, are sued under fictitious names pursuant to Code of
10 Civil Procedure Section 474 because Plaintiff does not know their true names or capacities. Plaintiff
11 will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint and serve such fictitiously named Defendants when
12 their names and capacities are ascertained.

13 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 50 are or
14 were the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers, or employees of Defendants at all relevant
15 times.

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

20 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each Defendant directly or
21 indirectly, through agents or other persons or entities, employed or otherwise exercised control over
22 the wages, hours, and working conditions of Plaintiff. Furthermore, each Defendant in all respects
23 acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the Class Members.

24 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and
25 omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendants and/or DOES 1 through
26 50, acting as the agent, alter ego, agent, servant, joint venturer, co-conspirator, and/or partner for the
27 other, within a common enterprise and legal authority to act on the other's behalf. The acts of any and
28 all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent, the official policy of Defendants.

22. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the scope of such agency or employment, or ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, and/or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

24. Plaintiff brings this class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated who were injured by Defendants' violations of the Labor Code, Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*, and IWC Wage Orders during the Class Period.

25. Plaintiff's proposed Class consists of and is defined as follows:

Class

All current and former non-exempt employees employed by Defendants in the State of California within four (4) years and 178 days prior to the commencement of this action to the date of class certification.

26. Plaintiff also seeks to certify the following Subclass:

Waiting Time Subclass

All Class Members who separated from their employment with Defendants at any time within three (3) years prior to the filing of this action to the date of class certification (“Subclass” or “Waiting Time Subclass”).

27. Members of the Class and Subclass described above will be collectively referred to as “Class Members.”

28. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify or re-define the Class or Subclass, establish additional subclasses, or modify or re-define any class or subclass definition as appropriate based on investigation, discovery, and specific theories of liability.

29. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the proposed Class

1 and Subclass are readily ascertainable.

2 30. **Commonality:** This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class
3 action under the California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because there are common questions
4 of law and fact as to the Class Members that predominate over any questions affecting only individual
5 members including, but not limited to, the following:

- 6 (a) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and Class Members all wages (including sick pay
7 and minimum, regular, and overtime wages) for all hours worked;
- 8 (b) Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to work off-the-clock
9 without compensation;
- 10 (c) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and Class Members at the proper rate of pay for
11 overtime, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay;
- 12 (d) Whether Defendants unlawfully deducted wages from Plaintiff and Class Members;
- 13 (e) Whether Defendants rounded meal periods;
- 14 (f) Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and Class Members with compliant meal
15 periods or paid compensation in lieu thereof;
- 16 (g) Whether Defendants authorized and permitted compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and
17 Class Members or paid compensation in lieu thereof;
- 18 (h) Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate
19 itemized wage statements;
- 20 (i) Whether Defendants failed to timely pay Class Members all wages due immediately
21 upon termination or within 72 hours of resignation;
- 22 (j) Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for necessary
23 business expenditures;
- 24 (k) Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless; and
- 25 (l) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of Business and
26 Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*

27 31. There is a well-defined community of interest. Further, Plaintiff and Class Members
28 have suffered common injuries as a result of Defendants' systemic employment policies and practices.

1 Looking to Defendants' employment policies and practices, the Court can adjudicate the lawfulness
2 of those policies and practices on a class-wide basis, according to proof, and issue an award to Plaintiff
3 and Class Members accordingly. In addition, answers to common questions raised in this Complaint
4 will advance resolution of each individual Class Member's claims.

5 32. **Numerosity:** The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all members is
6 impractical. Although the members of the entire Class and Subclass are unknown to Plaintiff at this
7 time, on information and belief, the class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals.

8 33. **Ascertainability:** The identities of the Class Members are readily ascertainable by
9 inspection of Defendants' employment and payroll records.

10 34. **Typicality:** The claims (or defenses, if any) of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the
11 Class Members because Defendants' failure to comply with the provisions of California's wage and
12 hour laws entitled each Class Member to similar pay, benefits, and other relief. The injuries sustained
13 by Plaintiff are also typical of the injuries sustained by Class Members because they arise out of and
14 are caused by Defendants' common course of conduct as alleged herein.

15 35. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of all
16 Class Members because it is in Plaintiff's best interest to prosecute the claims alleged herein to obtain
17 full compensation and penalties due to Plaintiff and the Class Members. Plaintiff's attorneys, as
18 proposed class counsel, are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions
19 and versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has
20 incurred and, throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs
21 that have been and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
22 benefit of the Class Members.

23 36. **Superiority:** The nature of this action makes use of class action adjudication superior
24 to other methods. A class action will achieve economies of time, effort, and expense as compared with
25 separate lawsuits and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can be adjudicated in
26 the same manner for the entire Class and Subclass at the same time. If appropriate, this Court can, and
27 is empowered to, fashion methods to efficiently manage this case as a class action.

28 37. **Public Policy Considerations:** Employers in the State of California violate

1 employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of
2 fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions because they
3 believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references
4 and/or other means. Class actions provide class members who are not named in the complaint with a
5 type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights while affording them privacy
6 protections.

7 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

8 38. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other
9 persons as non-exempt employees at Defendants' locations within California. Defendants employ
10 Plaintiff in a non-exempt position and continue to employ Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees
11 within California.

12 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
13 mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees, and other professionals who were
14 knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel practices, and the
15 requirements of California law.

16 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
17 have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members, and Defendants had the
18 financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly and intentionally failed to do so
19 all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

20 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
21 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive at least minimum wages, wages
22 at their regular rate of pay, and overtime wages, and that they were not receiving minimum, regular,
23 and overtime wages for all work that was required to be performed. Plaintiff is informed and believes,
24 and thereon alleges, that Plaintiff and Class Members regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours
25 per workday and/or over 40 hours per workweek. Specifically, in violation of the Labor Code and
26 IWC Wage Orders, Defendants paid Plaintiff and other Class Members on a piece rate basis (e.g.,
27 number of chickens that were processed) but made it appear as if they were hourly employees by
28 including purported bonuses and/or fluctuating hourly rates on their wage statements. In addition,

1 Defendants also failed to include non-discretionary commissions, bonuses, split shift premiums, shift
2 differentials, and/or other incentive pay when calculating the rate of pay for overtime, meal and rest
3 period premiums, and/or sick pay. Further, Defendants prevented Plaintiff and Class Members from
4 clocking in for their shifts until their scheduled start time and failed to compensate them for the work
5 performed before their scheduled start time. Defendants also unlawfully deducted the cost of tools and
6 other equipment from Plaintiff's and Class Members' pay. As such, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff
7 and other Class Members minimum, regular, and overtime wages for all hours worked including at
8 the appropriate rate of pay, in violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

9 42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
10 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive a timely, off-duty, uninterrupted
11 30-minute meal period for every five (5) hours of work, or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay
12 at their regular rate of pay when they did not receive a compliant meal period. In violation of the
13 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members regularly had their meal periods
14 missed, late, interrupted, rounded, auto-deducted, and/or shortened due to Defendants' excessive work
15 demands, understaffing, work demands, policies, and practices. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class
16 Members regularly missed meal periods due to the amount of work that had to be completed per
17 workday. In addition, Employers consolidated meal and rest periods, and thereby failed to provide all
18 required meal breaks. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other Class Members with an
19 additional hour of pay at their regular rate for every day in which they suffered a meal period violation.
20 As such, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other Class Members all required meal periods or
21 premium pay, in violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

22 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
23 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive a 10-minute, off-duty,
24 uninterrupted rest period for every four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof, or payment of one
25 (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they were not permitted to take a compliant
26 rest period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendants failed to provide
27 compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and Class Members due to its excessive demands, understaffing,
28 work demands, policies, and practices as mentioned above. As such, Plaintiff and Class Members

1 regularly had their rest breaks missed, shortened, late, and/or interrupted. Specifically, Defendants
2 failed to provide paid rest breaks to their piece rate employees. In addition, Defendants consolidated
3 meal and rest periods, and thereby failed to provide all required rest breaks. Further, Defendants failed
4 to compensate Plaintiff and other Class Members with an additional hour of pay at their regular rate
5 for every day in which they suffered a rest period violation. As such, Defendants failed to provide
6 Plaintiff and other Class Members all required rest periods or premium pay, in violation of the Labor
7 Code and IWC Wage Orders.

8 44. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
9 have known that Waiting Time Subclass Members who separated from their employment with
10 Defendants during the statutory period were entitled to timely payment of all wages due. In violation
11 of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Waiting Time Class Members did not receive payment of
12 all wages owed upon separation within the permissible time period due to, *inter alia*, Defendants'
13 failure to pay all wages including sick pay and minimum, straight time, and overtime wages, failure
14 to pay meal and rest period premiums, and reimburse expenses to Class Members.

15 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants knew or should
16 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage
17 statements. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members were
18 not furnished with complete and accurate wage statements that show all of the information required
19 by Labor Code Section 226, including, but not limited to, the address of the legal entity that is the
20 employer, the gross and net wages earned, the total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect
21 during the pay period, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

22 46. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should
23 have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to reimbursement for their necessary work-
24 related business expenses. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendants required
25 Plaintiff and Class Members to purchase and separately maintain their tools (e.g., knives, sharpening
26 equipment, plastic, fabric, steel gloves, protective arm equipment, and back support belt) and heavily
27 soiled uniforms without reimbursement. Indeed, Defendants even deducted the cost of tools and
28 equipment from Plaintiff's and Class Members' pay. Defendants also required Plaintiff and Class

1 Members to purchase safety equipment without reimbursement.

2 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES**

4 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

5 47. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
6 fully set forth herein.

7 48. At all times herein relevant, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections
8 204, 206, 221, 222, 223, 246, 246.5, 510, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, the applicable IWC
9 Wage Orders, and all applicable local minimum wage ordinances in effect throughout California.

10 49. Labor Code Section 204 and the IWC Wage Orders require timely payment of all
11 wages owed on regularly scheduled paydays at least twice during each calendar month, on days
12 designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. All wages in earned in excess of the
13 normal work period must be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

14 50. Labor Code Section 206 provides that in case of a dispute over wages, the employer
15 shall pay, without condition and promptly under the Labor Code all wages conceded due, leaving to
16 the employee all remedies he/she is otherwise entitled to as to any balance claimed.

17 51. The IWC Wage Orders define “hours worked” as “the time during which an employee
18 is subject to the control of an employer and includes all time the employee is suffered or permitted to
19 work, whether or not required to do so.”

20 52. Labor Code Section 221 provides that “[i]t shall be unlawful for any employer to collect
21 or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee.”

22 53. Labor Code Section 222 provides that “[i]t shall be unlawful, in case of any wage
23 agreement arrived at through collective bargaining, either wilfully or unlawfully or with intent to
24 defraud an employee, a competitor, or any other person, to withhold from said employee any part of
25 the wage agreed upon.”

26 54. Labor Code Section 223 provides that “[w]here any statute or contract requires an
27 employer to maintain the designated wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage
28 while purporting to pay the wage designated by statute or by contract.”

1 55. Labor Code Sections 246 and 246.5 provides for minimum requirements and
2 protections with respect to sick days.

3 56. Labor Code Section 510 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers pay
4 employees for all overtime hours at a rate of one and one-half times the employee's regular rate of pay
5 for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one (1) workday, 40 hours in one (1) workweek, and
6 after the first eight hours on the seventh consecutive workday in one (1) workweek. Labor Code
7 Section 510 and the IWC Wage Orders further require that employers pay employees double their
8 regular rate of pay for hours work in excess of 12 hours in a workday and after eight hours on the
9 seventh consecutive workday in one (1) workweek. Labor Code Section 510 requires payment of
10 overtime wages at one and one half times the "regular rate of pay," which includes all forms of
11 remuneration earned by the employee.

12 57. Labor Code Section 1182.12 sets forth the minimum hourly wage that must be paid to
13 all employees in California for all hours worked. Local minimum wage ordinances, may provide for
14 higher minimum wage rates that must be paid to employees for all hours worked in those locales where
15 each local ordinance is in effect. Labor Code Section 1197 affirms that it is unlawful to pay less than
16 the state or local minimum wage, whichever is higher, for any hour of work.

17 58. Labor Code Section 1194 requires that employers pay employees at least the legal
18 minimum wage rate for all hours worked, notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage.
19 Labor Code Section 1194 further authorizes any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage
20 applicable to the employee to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of wages,
21 along with interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

22 59. Labor Code Section 1194.2 authorizes the recovery of liquidated damages in an amount
23 equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon for unpaid wage violations.

24 60. Labor Code Section 1198 prohibits employers from employing for longer hours or less
25 favorable conditions than those set forth in the Labor Code, IWC Wage Orders, or as otherwise set by
26 the Labor Commissioner.

27 61. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
28 all wages due, including sick pay, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failed to pay all wages at

1 the appropriate rates including for off-the-clock work, and unlawfully deducted wages, among other
2 things.

3 62. In violation of California law, Defendants have knowingly and willfully refused to
4 perform their obligations and compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for all wages earned as alleged
5 above.

6 63. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all earned minimum, regular,
7 and overtime wages in accordance with Labor Code Sections 204, 206, 221, 222, 223, 246, 246.5, 510,
8 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198, the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and all applicable local
9 minimum wage ordinances in effect throughout California, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled
10 to recover the full amount of unpaid wages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, and statutory
11 penalties, along with attorneys' fees and costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

12 64. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
13 conduct described herein, have committed an "intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than
14 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
15 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period" within
16 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
17 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, gratuities, as
18 defined in Labor Code section 350, benefits, or other compensation, by unlawful means, with the
19 knowledge that the wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class
20 Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent are thus entitled to
21 recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to
22 California Penal Code section 496(c).

23 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

25 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

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

28 66. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 226.7

1 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

2 67. Labor Code Section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders prohibit an employer from
3 employing any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the
4 employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes (commencing before the employee's fifth
5 hour of work), except that if the total work period per day is no more than six (6) hours, the meal
6 period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee. A second meal period of not
7 less than 30 minutes is required if an employee works more than 10 hours per day and must begin
8 before the employee's tenth hour of work, except if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours,
9 the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, but only if
10 the first meal period was not waived. An employer must relieve an employee of all duties during meal
11 periods.

12 68. The applicable IWC Wage Orders state that "[u]nless the employee is relieved of all
13 duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an 'on duty' meal period
14 and counted as time worked."

15 69. Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and the IWC Wage Orders prohibit an employer from
16 requiring any employee to work during a meal period mandated by any California statute, regulation,
17 standard or order. If an employer fails to provide an employee with a meal period in accordance with
18 state law, Labor Code Section 226.7(c) and the IWC Wage Orders require that the employer pay the
19 employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each
20 workday that the meal period is noncompliant.

21 70. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive compliant
22 meal periods for working more than five (5) hours per day. Specifically, meal periods were late,
23 interrupted, rounded, auto-deducted, short, missed, and/or restricted to the worksite.

24 71. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
25 meal period premiums for noncompliant meal periods pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and
26 the applicable IWC Wage Order.

27 72. As a result of Defendants' failure to provide compliant meal periods and pay meal
28 period premiums to Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with the IWC Wage Orders and Labor

1 Code Sections 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of
2 wages and compensation.

3 73. Because Plaintiff and Class Members were and/or are entitled to such meal periods or
4 “premium pay” in lieu thereof, they are entitled to such payment per shift in an amount according to
5 proof. To the extent such unpaid premiums are deemed unpaid wages, Plaintiff will also seek pre- and
6 post-judgment interest as provided by law at 10% per annum, in an amount according to proof.

7 74. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
8 conduct described herein, have committed an “intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than
9 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
10 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period” within
11 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
12 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, gratuities, as
13 defined in Labor Code section 350, benefits, or other compensation, by unlawful means, with the
14 knowledge that the wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class
15 Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent are thus entitled to
16 recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including reasonable attorneys’ fees, pursuant to
17 California Penal Code section 496(c).

18 75. Also, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, Plaintiff will seek attorneys’
19 fees and costs from Defendants in an amount subject to proof and approved by the Court.

20 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

22 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

23 76. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
24 fully set forth herein.

25 77. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Section 226.7
26 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

27 78. The IWC Wage Orders require employers to authorize and permit all employees to take
28 10-minute duty-free rest periods for each four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof.

1 79. If an employer fails to provide an employee with a rest period in accordance with
2 California law, Labor Code Section 226.7(c) and the IWC Wage Orders require that the employer pay
3 the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each
4 workday that the rest period is noncompliant.

5 80. During the relevant time period, Defendants did not implement a compliant rest break
6 policy and/or practice. Consequently, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive a 10 minute rest
7 period for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof because rest breaks were interrupted,
8 missed, late, shortened, and/or restricted to the worksite.

9 81. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
10 rest period premiums for noncompliant rest periods pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7(b) and the
11 applicable IWC Wage Order.

12 82. As a result of Defendants' failure to provide compliant rest periods and pay rest period
13 premiums to Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
14 Sections 226.7 and 516, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages
15 and compensation.

16 83. Because Plaintiff and Class Members were and/or are entitled to such rest periods or
17 "premium pay" in lieu thereof, they are entitled to such payment per shift in an amount according to
18 proof. To the extent such unpaid premiums are deemed unpaid wages, Plaintiff will also seek pre- and
19 post-judgment interest as provided by law at 10% per annum, in an amount according to proof.

20 84. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants, through their
21 conduct described herein, have committed an "intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than
22 nine hundred fifty dollars (\$950) from any one employee, or two thousand three hundred fifty dollars
23 (\$2,350) in the aggregate from two or more employees...in any consecutive 12-month period" within
24 the meaning of California Penal Code section 487m. Specifically, Defendants have intentionally
25 deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of wages, as defined in Labor Code section 200, gratuities, as
26 defined in Labor Code section 350, benefits, or other compensation, by unlawful means, with the
27 knowledge that the wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation is due to Plaintiff and Class
28 Members under the law. Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent are thus entitled to

1 recover from Defendants treble damages and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to
2 California Penal Code section 496(c).

3 85. Also, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, Plaintiff will seek attorneys'
4 fees and costs from Defendants in an amount subject to proof and approved by the Court.

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

7 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

8 86. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
9 fully set forth herein.

10 87. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Section 226.

11 88. Labor Code Section 226(a) requires that, semimonthly or at the time of each payment
12 of wages, employers must furnish each employee with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing
13 that accurately shows (1) gross wages earned, (2) total number of hours worked, (3) the number of any
14 piece-rate units earned and all applicable piece rates, (4) all deductions made from wages, (5) net
15 wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name and last four digits or employment
16 identification number of the employee, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the
17 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect and the corresponding number of hours worked
18 at each hourly rate.

19 89. Labor Code Section 226(e)(1) authorizes an employee suffering injury as a result of a
20 knowing and intentional failure by an employer to provide an accurate itemized wage statement to
21 recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50 for the initial pay violation and \$100 for each violation
22 in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, in addition to
23 an award of costs and attorneys' fees.

24 90. During the relevant time period, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed
25 to comply with Labor Code Section 226(a) on wage statements that were provided to Plaintiff and
26 Class Members. The deficiencies include, among other things, Defendants' failure to correctly state
27 the address of the legal entity that is the employer, the gross and net wages earned, the total hours
28 worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding number of

1 hours worked at each hourly rate.

2 91. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code Section 226(a), Plaintiff
3 and Class Members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Specifically,
4 Plaintiff and Class Members have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California
5 Labor Code Section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their
6 protected interest in receiving, accurate itemized wage statements under California Labor Code
7 Section 226(a). Plaintiff has had to file this lawsuit in order to determine the extent of the
8 underpayment of wages, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses and lost time. Plaintiff would not
9 have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had Defendants provided the accurate wages
10 earned and number of hours worked at each corresponding pay rate. This has also delayed Plaintiff's
11 ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

12 92. Defendants' violations of California Labor Code Section 226(a) prevented Plaintiff and
13 Class Members from knowing, understanding and disputing the wages paid to them, and resulted in
14 an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional
15 failure to comply with California Labor Code Section 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members have
16 suffered an injury, and the exact amount of damages and/or penalties is all in an amount to be shown
17 according to proof at trial.

18 93. Plaintiff and Class Members are also entitled to injunctive relief under California Labor
19 Code Section 226(h), compelling Defendants to comply with California Labor Code Section 226, and
20 seek the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in obtaining this injunctive relief.

21 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

23 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

24 94. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
25 fully set forth herein.

26 95. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 201,
27 202, and 203. Defendants failed to comply with these final paycheck requirements with respect to
28 Waiting Time Subclass Members.

96. Labor Code Section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.

97. Labor Code Section 202 requires that if “an employee not having a written contract for a definite period” quits, the employee’s wages shall become due and payable no later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

98. Labor Code Section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, any wages of an employee who is discharged or quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced, but that the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days per employee.

99. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay Waiting Time Subclass Members all their earned wages upon termination including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime compensation, premium compensation, reimbursements, and/or sick pay either at the time of discharge or within 72 hours of leaving Defendants' employ.

100. As a result of Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed to Waiting Time Subclass Members in accordance with Labor Code Sections 201, 202 and 203, Waiting Time Subclass Members are entitled to recover waiting time penalties, prejudgment interest, attorneys' fees, and costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

101. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

102. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802. Defendants failed to comply with these indemnification and reimbursement requirements with respect to Plaintiff and Class Members.

103. Labor Code Section 2800 requires employers to indemnify employees for losses caused

1 by the employer's want of ordinary care. To the extent Defendants claim that Plaintiff and Class
2 Members failed to request, demand, notify or otherwise seek reimbursement for their expenses and
3 losses, Defendants were obligated to nevertheless indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members due to their
4 own negligence.

5 104. Labor Code Section 2802(a) requires that employers indemnify and reimburse
6 employees for all business expenses, which are defined as all necessary expenditures or losses incurred
7 by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of the employee's duties or otherwise incurred
8 based on the employee's obedience to the employer's directions. Labor Code Section 2802(b)
9 authorizes employees to recover in a court action interest which shall accrue from the date on which
10 the employee incurred the necessary expenditure or loss. Labor Code Section 2802(c) authorizes
11 employees, who to enforce their right to reimbursements under Labor Code Section 2802, to also
12 recover attorneys' fees and costs.

13 105. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to
14 purchase and separately maintain their heavily soiled uniforms and tools without reimbursement in
15 violation of Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802.

16 106. As a result of Defendants' failure to indemnify and reimburse Plaintiff and Class
17 Members for all business and work-related costs, expenditures, losses and expenses in accordance
18 with Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full
19 unreimbursed balance of reimbursements, expenditures and losses, prejudgment interest, and statutory
20 penalties, along with attorneys' fees and costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

21 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW**

23 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

24 107. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though
25 fully set forth herein.

26 108. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful
27 and harmful to Plaintiff and Class Members. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the
28 public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

1 109. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, violate California law and constitute unlawful
2 business acts or practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et*
3 *seq.*

4 110. A violation of Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.* may be
5 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law.

6 111. Defendants' policies and practices have violated state law in at least the following
7 respects:

- 8 (a) Failing to pay all sick pay and minimum, regular, and overtime wages, and wages at
9 the proper rate of pay for overtime, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay due
10 to Plaintiff and Class Members in violation of Labor Code Sections 204, 206, 246,
11 246.5, 510, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198;
- 12 (b) Unlawfully deducting wages from Plaintiff and Class Members in violation of Labor
13 Code Sections 221, 222, and 223;
- 14 (c) Failing to provide meal periods without paying Plaintiff and Class Members premium
15 wages for every day in which a meal period was not provided in violation of Labor
16 Code Sections 226.7 and 512;
- 17 (d) Failing to authorize or permit rest breaks without paying Plaintiff and Class Members
18 premium wages for every day in which a rest break was not authorized or permitted in
19 violation of Labor Code Section 226.7;
- 20 (e) Failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements
21 in violation of Labor Code Section 226;
- 22 (f) Failing to timely pay all earned wages to Waiting Time Subclass Members upon
23 separation of employment in violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202 and 203; and
- 24 (g) Failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members all necessary business expenses in
25 violation of Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802.

26 112. Defendants intentionally avoided paying Plaintiff and Class Members wages and
27 monies, thereby creating for Defendants an artificially lower cost of doing business in order to
28 undercut their competitors and establish and gain a greater foothold in the marketplace.

113. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17202, 17203, and 17208, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages unlawfully withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four (4) years prior to the filing of this action; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

114. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to an injunction, restitution, and other equitable relief against such unlawful practices to return all funds over which Plaintiff and Class Members have an ownership interest and to prevent future damage pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17200 *et seq.*

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004

(Against All Defendants)

115. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

116. Under Labor Code section 2699.3(a), a plaintiff may bring a cause of action under PAGA only after giving the LWDA and the employer notice of the Labor Code sections alleged to have been violated, and after receiving notice from the LWDA of its intention not to investigate or after 65 days have passed without notice from the LWDA.

117. On November 16, 2023, Plaintiff gave written notice of the specified provisions alleged to have been violated by Defendants including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, as required by Labor Code section 2699.3. This written notice was provided via certified mail to Defendants and to the LWDA by electronically filing the notice via the Department of Industrial Relations' website. More than 65 days have passed since Plaintiff submitted his PAGA notice to the LWDA without a response from the LWDA. Accordingly, Plaintiff may amend the Complaint to add a PAGA cause of action against Defendants.

118. Under Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(2)(C), “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a plaintiff may as a matter of right amend an existing complaint to add a cause of action arising under this part at any time within 60 days of the time periods specified in this part.” More than 65 days

1 have passed since Plaintiff submitted his PAGA notice to the LWDA without notice from the LWDA.
2 Accordingly, Plaintiff may amend his Complaint as a matter of right within this 60 day period as
3 specified by Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(2)(C).

4 119. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that provides
5 for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions,
6 commissions, boards, agencies or employees for violation of the code may, as an alternative, be
7 recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself and other
8 current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

9 120. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
10 specifically provided, Labor Code section 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred
11 dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred
12 dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent pay period in which
13 Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

14 121. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff may seek civil penalties
15 for any alleged violation of the following provisions: subdivision (k) of Section 96, Sections 98.6, 201,
16 201.3, 201.5, 201.7, 202, 203, 203.1, 203.5, 204, 204a, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, 206, 206.5,
17 208, 209, and 212, subdivision (d) of Section 213, Sections 221, 222, 222.5, 223, and 224, paragraphs
18 (1) to (5), inclusive, (7), and (9) of subdivision (a) of Section 226, Sections 226.7, 227, 227.3, 230,
19 230.1, 230.2, 230.3, 230.4, 230.7, 230.8, and 231, subdivision (c) of Section 232, subdivision (c) of
20 Section 232.5, Sections 233, 234, 351, 353, and 403, subdivision (b) of Section 404, Sections 432.2,
21 432.5, 432.7, 435, 450, 510, 511, 512, 513, 551, 552, 601, 602, 603, 604, 750, 751.8, 800, 850, 851,
22 851.5, 852, 921, 922, 923, 970, 973, 976, 1021, 1021.5, 1025, 1026, 1101, 1102, 1102.5, and 1153,
23 subdivisions (c) and (d) of Section 1174, Sections 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, and 1198, subdivision
24 (b) of Section 1198.3, Sections 1199, 1199.5, 1290, 1292, 1293, 1293.1, 1294, 1294.1, 1294.5, 1296,
25 1297, 1298, 1301, 1308, 1308.1, 1308.7, 1309, 1309.5, 1391, 1391.1, 1391.2, 1392, 1683, and 1695,
26 subdivision (a) of Section 1695.5, Sections 1695.55, 1695.6, 1695.7, 1695.8, 1695.9, 1696, 1696.5,
27 1696.6, 1697.1, 1700.25, 1700.26, 1700.31, 1700.32, 1700.40, and 1700.47, Sections 1735, 1771,
28 1774, 1776, 1777.5, 1811, 1815, 2651, and 2673, subdivision (a) of Section 2673.1, Sections 2695.2,

1 2800, 2801, 2802, 2806, and 2810, subdivision (b) of Section 2929, and Sections 3073.6, 6310, 6311,
2 and 6399.7.

3 122. Defendants' conduct violates numerous Labor Code sections, including, but not limited
4 to, the following:

5 123. Violation of Labor Code sections 201-204, 206, 210, 221, 222, 223, 226.2, 246, 246.5,
6 248.5, 256, 510, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 for failure to timely pay all earned wages
7 (including sick pay, minimum, regular, overtime, and double time wages) owed to Plaintiff and other
8 aggrieved employees during employment and upon separation of employment as herein alleged;

9 124. Violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal periods to
10 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed meal periods as
11 herein alleged;

12 125. Violation of Labor Code sections 226.2 and 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to
13 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed rest periods as
14 herein alleged;

15 126. Violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 226.3 for failure to provide accurate itemized
16 wage statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged;

17 127. Violation of Labor Code sections 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain accurate
18 records regarding the employment of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged; and

19 128. Violation of Labor Code section 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse Plaintiff and
20 other aggrieved employees for business expenses.

21 129. Labor Code Section 226.3 provides: "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of
22 Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per
23 employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each
24 violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
25 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226. The civil
26 penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law."

27 130. Labor Code section 558(a) provides "[a]ny employer or other person acting on behalf
28 of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision

1 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject
2 to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid
3 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid . . . (2) For each subsequent
4 violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
5 employee was underpaid.”

6 131. Labor Code Section 1174.5 provides a \$500 penalty for an employer’s failure to
7 maintain accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid
8 to employees.

9 132. Labor Code section 1197.1 also provides “[a]ny employer or other person acting either
10 individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays or causes to be paid to
11 any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order
12 of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty . . . as follows: (1) For any initial violation that is
13 intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period
14 for which the employee is underpaid . . . (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific
15 offense, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which
16 the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is intentionally committed.

17 133. As set forth above, Defendants have violated numerous provisions of the Labor Code
18 regulating hours and days of work as well as the IWC Wage Orders. Accordingly, Plaintiff also seeks
19 the civil penalties set forth in Labor Code sections 558 and 1197.1 for himself, the underpaid
20 employees, and the State of California.

21 134. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” because he was employed by the alleged violators
22 and had one or more of the alleged violations committed against him, and therefore is properly suited
23 to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

24 135. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code section 2699.3
25 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself and all other
26 aggrieved employees under PAGA.

27 136. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to
28 recover civil penalties, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code sections cited

1 above.

2 137. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees and costs incurred herein.

3 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and other Class Members,
5 other aggrieved employees, and the State of California, prays for relief and judgment against
6 Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 7 1. For certification of this action as a class action, including certifying the Class and
8 Subclass alleged by Plaintiff;
- 9 2. For appointment of Plaintiff Jorge Fonseca as the class representative;
- 10 3. For appointment of Torus LLP as class counsel for all purposes;
- 11 4. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof with interest thereon;
- 12 5. For economic and/or special damages in an amount according to proof with interest
13 thereon;
- 14 6. For damages, monetary relief, wages, premiums, reimbursements, benefits and
15 penalties, including interest thereon;
- 16 7. For waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 203;
- 17 8. For the amounts provided for in Labor Code Section 226.7;
- 18 9. For liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194.2;
- 19 10. For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to the
20 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- 21 11. For restitution to Plaintiff and Class Members of all money and property unlawfully
22 acquired by Defendants through unfair or unlawful business practices pursuant to
23 Business and Professions Code Sections 17200 *et seq.*;
- 24 12. For an order requiring Defendants to restore and disgorge all funds to each employee
25 acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, unfair
26 or fraudulent and, therefore, constituting unfair competition under Business and
27 Professions Code Sections 17200, *et seq.*;
- 28 13. For permanent injunctive relief described in the UCL cause of action;

14. For prejudgment interest on all sums recovered pursuant to Labor Code Section 218.6 and Civil Code Sections 3287 and 3289, and applicable law;
15. For post judgment interest on all amounts awarded to Plaintiff and Class Members as provided by law;
16. For recovery of attorneys' fees and costs provided by Labor Code Sections 218.6, 226, 1194, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5;
17. For a declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under California law;
18. Such other equitable relief as the Court may deem proper;
19. For treble damages;
20. For PAGA penalties; and
21. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: January 23, 2024

TORUS LLP

By: 

Daniel J. Hyun

David Alami

Attorneys for Plaintiff JORGE FONSECA

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable by jury.

Dated: January 23, 2024

TORUS LLP

By: 

Daniel J. Hyun

David Alami

Attorneys for Plaintiff JORGE FONSECA