BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.
Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq., CA Bar No. 285256
mehrdad@bokhourlaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 920
Ventura, California 90067
Tel: (310) 975-1493; Fax: (310) 675-0861

FALAKASSA LAW, P.C.
Joshua S. Falakassa, CA Bar No. 295045
josh@falakassalaw.com
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 920
Ventura, California 90067
Tel: (818) 456-6168; Fax: (888) 505-0868

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Classes

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA

ZULMA HERNANDEZ, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

VENTURA TRANSIT SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation; SHUTTLEBUS, a California Corporation; and DOES 1-50, inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2023CUOE016545

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT:

(1) FAILURE TO PAY ALL MINIMUM WAGES;
(2) FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES;
(3) MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS;
(4) REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS;
(5) FAILURE TO PAY ALL SICK TIME;
(6) WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS;
(7) WAITING TIME PENALTIES;
(8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES;
(9) VIOLATIONS OF ICRAA, CIVIL CODE §1786.16;
(10) UNFAIR COMPETITION &
(11) PAGA PENALTIES (LABOR CODE § 2698 *et seq.*)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Zulma Hernandez ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated non-exempt employees, alleges and complains of Defendants Ventura Transit Systems, Inc. doing business as ShuttleBus, and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively, "Defendants") and each of them, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Defendants is a family-owned company with more than 60 years in the transportation industry. Plaintiff brings this class action lawsuit against Defendants for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code.

2. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to pay all minimum and overtime wages for all hours worked, and that Defendants failed to pay all overtime compensation and sick pay wages at the proper legal rates by failing to properly calculate the "regular rate of pay." In addition, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' meal and rest period policies and practices failed to allow and permit non-exempt employees to take all compliant and timely meal and rest periods or pay premium wages at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide non-exempt employees with accurate written itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226(a), failed to reimburse for all necessary business expenses and failed to timely pay all final wages upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203. Finally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act ("ICRAA"), Civil Code §1786.16.

3. Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class action and representative action to recover unpaid wages, restitution, penalties, and other related relief on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated non-exempt employees.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated employees hereby brings this class action for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 221, 226(a), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1174, 1174.4, 1199, 2802-2804, and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("Wage Orders"), in addition to seeking declaratory relief and restitution pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq*.

5. This class action is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

6. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders because the amount in controversy exceeds this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

7. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, Defendants operate in California within the County of Ventura, and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

PARTIES

8. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff, who is over the age of 18, was and currently is a California resident residing in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee in the County of Ventura.

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are authorized to and doing business within the County of Ventura and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Class Members during the applicable statutory periods. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants' policies and/or practices complained of herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed to her by California Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 226, 226(a), 226(e), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 516, 1174, 1174.4, 1199, 2802-2804, and the California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*., and applicable Wage Orders.

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the four years preceding the filing of the Complaint and continuing to the present, Defendants did (and continue to do) business in the State of California, County of Ventura.

11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious Defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate, were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes to be subject to the unlawful employment practices

alleged herein.

12. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and all members of the Classes. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

13. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and all members of the Classes.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

14. Defendants are a family-owned company with more than 60 years in the transportation industry serving both Los Angeles and Ventura County. Defendants employed the plaintiff as a non-exempt employee with the title of "Bus Operator/Driver." Plaintiff began working for Defendants from April 1, 2023, to May 5, 2021, until her separation from employment on October 6, 2023.

15. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees (including, but not limited to, Shuttle Driver, Paratransit Operator, Call Taker, Office Staff, Marketing Staff, and all other non-exempt positions) were responsible for all aspects of Defendants' business in the State of California. However, in these roles Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were often not afforded all protections and rights conferred under the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

16. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees regularly worked various shifts, many of which were in excess of 8.0 hours in a workday and 40.0 hours in a workweek. Plaintiff alleges that other non-exempt employees were also subjected to the same policies, procedures, and practices, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations to which

she was subjected during her employment.

17. First, at all relevant times, Defendant failed to accurately record all time worked by Plaintiff and other Class Members because, amongst other things, Defendant uniformly automatically deducted 30 minutes or 1 hour from non-exempt employees' time entries -without regard to whether such a meal period was actually allowed and permitted. Indeed, Defendant automatically assumed that all meal periods were taken and were legally complaint. Defendant automatically scheduled Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees' for their daily shifts and routes, which included automatically scheduled meal periods.While Defendant required Plaintiff and other employees to clock-in/out using paper time sheets, these timesheets only included employees' start and end times. Defendant did not have a method by which Class Members would record their meal periods at all. Instead, Defendant automatically deducted 30 minutes or 1 hour for all meal periods, regardless of whether such uninterrupted meal periods were permitted. In reality, Plaintiff and other Class Members report that they were often unable to take meal periods, had their meal periods interrupted, or were required to remain working during meal periods due to their routes, and work demands. However, because Defendant is capable of tracking the actual time worked by employees to the minute, this policy/practice exists not for the convenience or benefit of the employees who would accurately report their time on timecards, but for Defendant's benefit. Defendant's policy/practice in application, results in a systematic underpayment of wages to the putative class members during each shift.

18. As a result, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees are not compensated for all the hours that they work or were subject to the control of Defendants in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1197.1, 1199, and applicable Wage Orders.

19. Here, Defendants' timekeeping practice/policy is not neutral on its face or in its application as Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees are subject to discipline, including termination for being tardy in reporting to work, or returning from a meal period. Moreover, because Defendants can track the exact time worked by non-exempt employees to the exact minute, the policy itself exists not for the convenience or benefit of the employees who are trying to accurately report their time, but for Defendants' benefit. As a result, the policy is not neutral on its face or in its

application, and in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1197.1, 1199, and applicable Wage Orders.

20. Labor Code § 1197.1 authorizes employees who are paid less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order of the commission a civil penalty, restitution of wages, and liquidate damages as follows: (1) for any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid....[and] (2) [f]or each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty dollars ($250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is intentionally committed. Additionally, Labor Code § 510 requires an employer to compensate an employee who works more than eight (8) hours in one workday, forty (40) hours in a workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day, no less than one and one-half times (11/2) the regular rate of pay.

21. In addition, Labor Code § 510 obligates employers to compensate employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve (12) hours in a workday or more than eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. Pursuant to Section 3 of the applicable Wage Orders, non-exempt employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or more than 40 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (11/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek.

22. Further, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees worked regular shifts that lasted longer than 8.0 hours in a workday and resulted non-exempt employees regularly working more than 40 hours in a workweek. However, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not properly paid at the correct overtime rate for all overtime hours worked due to Defendants' uniform failure to include all forms of compensation/renumeration, including, but not limited to, incentives, bonuses, commissions, and all other forms of renumeration in calculating the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of overtime compensation.

23. Under the California Labor Code (as well as the FLSA), courts have consistently held that regularly paid non-discretionary bonuses (and other forms of pay) must be included in

determining an employee's "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime. (See *Haber v. The Americana Corp.* 378 F. 2d 854, 855-856 (9th Cir. 1967) [holding that regularly paid efficiency bonuses must be included in calculating the "regular rate"]; *Wang v. Chinese Daily News*, Inc. 435 F. Supp. 2d 1042, 1055-1057 (C.D. Cal. 2006) [granting summary judgement to Plaintiff under California and federal law on the grounds, that Defendants improperly calculated overtime by excluding annual bonuses paid to employees from the "regular rate of compensation"]; see *Walling v. Youngerman-Reynolds Hardwood Co*. (1945) 65 S.Ct. 1242, 1245. ("The regular rate by its very nature must reflect all payments which the parties have agreed shall be received regularly during the workweek, exclusive of overtime payments. It is not an arbitrary label chosen by the parties; it is an actual fact. Once the parties have decided upon the amount of wages and the mode of payment the determination of the regular rate becomes a matter of mathematical computation, the result of which is unaffected by any designation of a contrary 'regular rate' in the contracts."); see also 29 CFR §§ 778.110 ("production bonus") and 778.111 ("piece-rate").)

24. Labor Code § 510 requires an employer to compensate an employee who works more than eight (8.0) hours in one workday, forty (40) hours in a workweek, and for the first eight (8.0) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day, no less than one and one-half times (11/2) the regular rate of pay. In addition, Labor Code § 510 obligates employers to compensate employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve (12) hours in a workday or more than eight (8.0) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. Pursuant to Section 3 of the applicable Wage Orders, non-exempt employees shall not be employed more than eight (8.0) hours in any workday or more than 40.0 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (11/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek.

25. By their policy of requiring Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees to work in excess of eight (8.0) hours in a workday and/or forty (40.0) hours in a workweek without compensating them at the lawful rate of one-half (1 1/2) their regular rate of pay, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code § 510 and the applicable Wage Orders.

26. Furthermore, at all relevant times, Defendants also failed in its obligation to provide

Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a),(b), which requires that "[a]n employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days. . . at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment." Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees must be "calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek."

27. Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be "calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Finally, Labor Code §246(i) requires employers to "provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

28. Here, at all relevant times, Defendants failed in its obligation to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate, including all forms of compensation, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a), (b). As such, Defendants paid sick time below "regular rate of pay" as required by Labor Code §§ 246(l) (1-2).

29. Additionally, at all relevant times, Defendant failed and continues to fail to timely pay all wages to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees in violation of Labor Code § 204. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were and are routinely paid on a "weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly" payroll, but Defendant failed and continues to fail to pay all wages within seven (7) calendar days of the close of the payroll period.

30. Labor Code § 204 "pertains to the timing of wage payments" and serves a very important public policy objective. "It has long been recognized that wages are not ordinary debts, . . . and that, because of the economic position of the average worker and, in particular, his dependence on wages for the necessities of life for himself and his family, it is essential to the public welfare that

he receive his pay when it is due." (*See* also *In re Trombley* (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 801, 810-11 (citing *In re Moffett* (1937) 19 Cal.App.2d 7, 19). The penalties for violating Labor Code § 204 are set forth in Labor Code section 210(a) as follows: [E]very person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections . . . 204 . . . shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars ($100) for each failure to pay each employee. (2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars ($200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

31. Due to Defendant's uniform pay policies/practices of failing to pay Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees timely, violated the provisions of Labor Code § 204 and the applicable Wage Orders. Accordingly, to the extent permitted by law, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees are entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210(a), or Labor Code § 2699(f)(2).

32.

33. Furthermore, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were denied compliant and timely 30-minute off-duty meal periods as mandated by California law. Due to Defendants uniform meal period policies/practices, operational requirements, and work demands, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were often unable to take timely and uninterrupted net 30-minute first meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work.

34. Further, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were often unable to take a second 30 minute uninterrupted and timely meal period for shifts in excess of 10.0 hours. In addition, for each missed or non-compliant meal period, Defendants failed and continues to fail to maintain a mechanism by which non-exempt employees were paid meal period premiums at the "regular rate of pay" pursuant to *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 5th 858 and Labor Code § 226.7.

35. Accordingly, due to Defendants uniform meal period practices, non-exempt employees were also regularly denied legally compliant meal periods in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 516, and applicable Wage Orders.

36. Next, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not provided with all uninterrupted 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction

thereof due to Defendants uniform rest period policies/practices, operational requirements, and work demands. As a result, other non-exempt employees were and are often unable to take a net 10-minute duty free rest periods for every major fraction of four hours worked. This includes a second rest period for shifts in excess of six hours, and a third rest period for shifts in excess of 10 hours in a workday.

37. By not relieving all non-exempt employees of all duties during rest periods, Defendants failed to provide legally compliant rest periods. See *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc*. (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 257, 269 [concluding that "during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time."] (Emphasis added). In *Augustus*, the California Supreme Court expressly rejected the employers' assertion that it could provide an on-duty rest period to employees who worked as security guards and further explained "that employers [must] relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time and relieve their employees of all duties." *Id*. at 273. Each time non-exempt employees were unable to take a compliant rest period, Defendants failed and continues to fail to adequately pay rest period premium payments at the "regular rate of pay" as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

38. Accordingly, due to Defendants uniform rest period policies/practices, non-exempt employees were regularly denied legally compliant rest breaks in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and applicable Wage Orders.

39. As a result of Defendants failure to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants, including all, overtime, sick pay wages, and Defendants failure to pay for meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Defendants issued wage statements which failed to accurately identify the gross wages earned, the total hours worked, the net wages earned, and the correct corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1, 2, 5, and 9).

40. Labor Code § 226.3 provides that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) per employee per violation in an initial violation and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

41. Thus, for the violations of Labor Code section 226 described above, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees may also recover Labor Code § 226.3 penalties for Defendants violations of Labor Code § 226(a). Consequently, because Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees would be entitled to recover penalties under Labor Code §§ 226(e).

42. Moreover, because of, Defendants failure to pay all overtime, sick pay wages, and meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay," Defendants also failed and continues to fail to pay the non-exempt employees all wages owed at their time of separation from employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203. Thus, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees would be entitled to recover penalties under Labor Code §§ 201-203.

43. Moreover, at all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to incur necessary business expenses associated with using their personal cell phones for work related purposes but did not reimburse non-exempt employees adequately for these necessary expenditures in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802-2804. See *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc*., (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1144 ["[i]f an employee is required to make work-related calls on a personal cell phone, then he or she is incurring an expense for the purposes of section 2802. It does not matter whether the phone bill is paid for by a third person, or at all...To show liability under section 2802, an employee need only show that he or she was required to use a personal cell phone to make work-related calls, and he or she was not reimbursed"].

44. Here, Defendants uniformly failed to reimburse non-exempt employees for a reasonable portion of cell phone bill, and other necessary costs incurred, in the discharge of their duties for those non-exempt employees. Accordingly, due to Defendants' uniform failure to adequately reimburse for necessary business expenditures in violation of Labor Code §§ 2800-2802 and applicable Wage Orders.

45. Finally, the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act ("ICRAA"), Civil Code §1786.16, requires as follows: (B) The person procuring or causing the report to be made provides a clear and conspicuous disclosure in writing to the consumer at any time before the report is procured or caused to be made in a document that consists solely of the disclosure, that:(i) An investigative

consumer report may be obtained. (ii) The permissible purpose of the report is identified. (iii) The disclosure may include information on the consumer's character, general reputation, personal characteristics, and mode of living. (iv) Identifies the name, address, and telephone number of the investigative consumer reporting agency conducting the investigation.(v) Notifies the consumer in writing of the nature and scope of the investigation requested, including a summary of the provisions of Section 1786.22.(vi) Notifies the consumer of the Internet Web site address of the investigative consumer reporting agency identified in clause (iv), or, if the agency has no Internet Website address, the telephone number of the agency, where the consumer may find information about the investigative reporting agency's privacy practices, including whether the consumer's personal information will be sent outside the United States or its territories and information that complies with subdivision (d) of Section 1786.20. This clause shall become operative on January 1, 2012. (C) The consumer has authorized in writing the procurement of the report.

46. Here, at all relevant times, Defendants failed to provide the necessary information in its disclosures to Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees before it obtained reports in direct violation of the ICRAA. Specifically, the disclosure form provided to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees fails to provide the required information per the ICRAA, including that (iii) The disclosure may include information on the consumer's character, general reputation, personal characteristics, and mode of living. (iv) Identifies the name, address, and telephone number of the investigative consumer reporting agency conducting the investigation. (v) Notifies the consumer in writing of the nature and scope of the investigation requested, including a summary of the provisions of Section 1786.22.(vi) Notifies the consumer of the Internet Web site address of the investigative consumer reporting agency identified in clause (iv). None of this required information is present in the Notice.

47. Thus, based upon its written policy and practice, Defendant obtained consent from Plaintiff and the applicant employees using the disclosure form that was not compliant and was missing critical information. Defendants' policy and practice was willful as its policy and practice violates the plain language of the ICRAA. Accordingly, for each violating consumer report, the ICRAA provides for damages of $10,000 per violation (See California Civil Code § 1786.16).

48. Defendants also failed to maintain accurate and complete payroll records as required

by California Labor Code § 1174(d).

49. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to record all hours worked, overtime hours, and meal and rest periods taken or missed. Defendants' payroll records were incomplete and inaccurate, making it difficult for Plaintiff and Class Members to verify wages owed.

50. By failing to maintain proper records, Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the Class of their ability to ensure proper payment of wages and compliance with California's wage and hour laws.

51. As a result of these failures, Plaintiff and the Class have been harmed and are entitled to all available remedies, including statutory penalties under Labor Code § 1174.5.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

52. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and the following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

> All non-exempt employees who work or worked for Defendants in California, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("the Class");
>
> All non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California and who worked overtime hours during at least one shift, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("the Overtime Subclass");
>
> All non-exempt employees who work or worked for Defendants in California, during the one year immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("the Wage Statement Subclass")
>
> All non-exempt employees who work or worked for Defendants in California, and who left their employment during the three years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint through the date of trial. ("the Waiting Time Penalty Subclass")
>
> All employees who work or worked for Defendants in California during the last two years, and for who Defendant provided a non-compliant disclosure under the ICRAA. ("the ICRAA Subclass")
> (collectively "the Classes")

53. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the Classes consist of at least one

hundred (100) individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment and payroll records.

54. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of Interest**: There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated non-exempt employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:

1. Whether Defendants failed to properly record and pay for all time worked or time Class Members were subject to Defendants' control

2. Whether Defendants failed to pay overtime and sick pay wages at the "regular rate of pay" to the members of the Class;

3. Whether Defendants provided legally compliant meal and rest periods or proper compensation at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof to members of the Class;

4. Whether Defendants allowed and permitted Plaintiff and the Class to take legally compliant meal periods or pay premium wages at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof;

5. Whether Defendants allowed and permitted Plaintiff and the Class to take legally compliant rest periods or pay premium wages at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof;

6. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Subclass pursuant to Labor Code § 226(a);

7. Whether Defendants accurately paid all sick pay wages owed using the "regular rate of pay" to Plaintiff and members of the Class;

8. Whether the timing and amount of payment of final wages to members of the Waiting Time Penalty Subclass at the time of separation from employment were unlawful;

9. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802-2804; and

10. Whether Defendants violated the ICRAA by providing non-complaint disclosures to Plaintiff and the ICRAA Subclass.

55. **Predominance of Common Questions**: Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common

questions of law set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member, such as without limitation, Defendants' failure to pay for all hours worked, and failure to adequately calculate the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of overtime pay and sick pay, Defendants' failure to provide all compliant meal and rest periods or premiums at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof, Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, Defendants' failure to pay for all wages due upon separation of employment, and Defendants' failure to provide legally complaint disclosures under the ICRAA. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

56. **Typicality**: The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s) of limitation applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint in this action. As alleged herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes was deprived of overtime wages, sick pay wages, was deprived of meal and rest period premium wages, was subject to Defendants' uniform meal and rest period policies/practices, was not provided accurate itemized wage statements, was not timely paid all wages owed upon separation of employment, and was provided a non-compliant disclosure under the ICRAA.

57. **Adequacy of Representation**: Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes. Plaintiff's attorneys have prosecuted and are actively litigating several wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal courts and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

58. **Superiority**: The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The

nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

59. Moreover, requiring each member of the Classes to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the individual members of the class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As such, the Classes identified in Paragraph 44 are maintainable as Classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

60. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.’

61. Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order(s) and Labor Code §§ 1197 and 1182.12 establish the right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law. Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with attorneys’ fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid

wages and interest accrued thereon.

62. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to the requirements of the law. This unlawful conduct includes but is not limited to, Defendants' uniform and unlawful policy/practice of automatically deducting 30 to 60 minutes for meal periods, which resulted in these individuals not being paid for all hours they were actually suffered or permitted worked. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and members of the Classes were not compensated for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

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

64. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiffs and the Classes have sustained economic damages, including but not limited to unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and they are entitled to recover economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief as a result of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

65. Defendants' practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding illegal employee compensation is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiffs and members of the Classes in a civil action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages, liquidated damages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 204, 558, 1194 *et seq*., 1197, 1198, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

66. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

67. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 558, 1194,

and 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

68. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Subclass for all overtime hours worked pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 and the applicable Wage Orders.

69. Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay an employee "one and one-half (11⁄2) times the employee's regular rate of pay" for work in excess of 8 hours per workday and/or in excess of 40 hours of work in the workweek. The same section also requires an employer to pay an employee double the employee's regular rate of pay for work in excess of twelve hours each workday and/or for work in excess of 8 hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in the workweek. Defendants caused Plaintiff to work overtime and hours but did not compensate Plaintiff or members of the Overtime Subclass at one and one-half times their "regular rate of pay" for such hours.

70. Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to the requirements of the law. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to the requirements of the law. This unlawful conduct includes but is not limited to Defendants time rounding policy/practice, and Defendants' failure to properly pay for all hours worked, including all overtime hours at the proper overtime rate, and Defendants' failure to include all forms of compensation, including, but not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses and other incentive pay in calculating the "regular rate of pay," which resulted in these individuals not being paid for all overtime hours worked.

71. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the Overtime Subclass in a civil action for the unpaid amount of overtime wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, and 1198, the applicable Wage Orders, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

72. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

73. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their hourly non-exempt employees, including, Plaintiff and members of the Class, with all required meal periods in accordance with the mandates of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders, for the reasons set forth in the Common Allegations section of this Complaint.

74. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants have not paid an additional hour of pay at the "regular rate of pay" to Plaintiff and members of the Class at their respective regular rates of pay for each violation, in accordance with California Labor Code § 226.7.

75. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal period violations, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the applicable Wage Orders, Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

76. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

77. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516 establish the right of non-exempt employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour period worked, or major fraction thereof.

78. Due to their unlawful rest period policy/practices and operational requirements/work demands, Defendants did not authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Class to take all rest periods to which they were legally entitled.

79. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants have not paid an additional hour of pay at the "regular rate of pay" to Plaintiff and members of the Class at their respective regular rates of pay for each violation, in accordance with California Labor Code § 226.7.

80. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest

thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the applicable Wage Orders, Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

<u>FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

FAILURE TO PAY ALL SICK TIME

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

81. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

82. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199 which provide that "[a]n employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days. . . at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment."

83. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly pay Plaintiff and members of the Class for all sick time pursuant to California Labor Code § 246 and the applicable Wage Orders.

84. Labor Code § 246(l)(1) provides that paid sick time for non-exempt employees must be "calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek." Additionally, Labor Code § 246(l)(2) states that the paid sick time must be "calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Finally, Labor Code §246(i) requires employers to "provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

85. Defendants failed in their obligation to provide Plaintiff and the Class the legally required paid sick days at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246(a),(b). Plaintiff and the members of the Class were not paid at the correct "regular rate of pay."

86. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of wages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 246 1192, 1194 *et seq*., 1197, 1198, the applicable Wage Orders, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

87. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

88. Labor Code 226(a) states in pertinent part the following:

> "(a) An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee."

89. As set forth above, during the Class Period, Defendants issued and continue to issue wage statements to its employees including Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Subclass, which are inadequate under Labor Code Section 226(a).

90. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Subclass for all overtime wages, sick pay, and missed meal and rest period premiums at the appropriate legal rate, Defendants failed to include required information on Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Subclass' wage statements, including, but not limited to, the gross wages earned, the net wages earned in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1,2,5, and 9).

91. Defendants' failure to comply with section 226(a) of the Labor Code was knowing

and intentional.

92. As a result of Defendants' issuance of inaccurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Subclass in violation of section 226(a) of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Subclass are each entitled to recover an initial penalty of $50, and subsequent penalties of $100, up to an amount not exceeding an aggregate penalty of $4,000 per Plaintiff and per every member of the Wage Statement Subclass from Defendants pursuant to section 226(e) of the Labor Code, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAITING TIME PENALTIES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

93. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

94. The actionable period for this cause of action is three years prior to the filing of this Complaint through the present, and on-going until the violation is corrected, or the class is certified.

95. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require Defendants to pay all compensation due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Subclass during the actionable period for this cause of action at or around the time that their employment is or was terminated or ended.

96. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required by Labor Code sections 201 and 202, then the employer is liable for penalties in the form of continued compensation up to thirty (30) workdays.

97. Defendants willfully failed to pay the Waiting Time Subclass for all hours worked, including all minimum and overtime wages, sick pay wages, vested vacation pay, and their meal and rest period premiums at the "regular rate of pay", prior to or upon termination or separation from employment with Defendants as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

98. As a result, Defendants are liable to the Waiting Time Subclass for waiting time penalties amounting to thirty (30) days wages for Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Subclass pursuant to Labor Code § 203. *See,* e.g., DLSE Manual, 4.3.4 (Failure to pay any sort of wages due upon termination entitles an employee to recover waiting time penalties).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENDITURES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

99. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

100. Labor Code 2802(a) states in pertinent part the following: "(a) An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

101. As set forth above, Plaintiff and members of the Class must be compensated for all necessary business expenditures, including, but not limited to, a reasonable portion of their monthly personal cell phone bills incurred in their discharge of their duties. (See *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137 ("We hold that when employees must use their personal cell phones for work-related calls, Labor Code section 2802 requires the employer to reimburse them. Whether the employees have cell phone plans with unlimited minutes or limited minutes, the reimbursement owed is a reasonable percentage of their cell phone bills."); *Ritchie v. Blue Shield of California*, 2014 WL 6982943, at *21 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (certifying class of cell phone reimbursement claim and adopting the logic of *Cochran*).

102. At all relevant times, by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for all necessary business expenditures, Defendants have failed to comply with Labor Code Section 2802 and the applicable Wage Orders.

<u>NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

VIOLATIONS OF THE ICRAA

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

103. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

104. ICRAA includes the following liability provision to encourage compliance with its terms: "(a)An investigative consumer reporting agency or user of information that fails to comply with any requirement under this title with respect to an investigative consumer report is liable to the consumer who is the subject of the report in an amount equal to the sum of all the following:

[¶](1)Any actual damages sustained by the consumer as a result of the failure or, except in the case of class actions, ten thousand dollars ($10,000), whichever sum is greater." (§1786.50, subd.(a)(1).)

105. Plaintiff alleges that, while evaluating Plaintiff's for employment, Defendant procured credit and background reports about Plaintiff in violation of ICRAA.

106. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant ran afoul of the ICRAA's disclosure requirements by willfully failing to include the necessary information in its disclosure documentation, including information on the consumer's character, general reputation, personal characteristics, and mode of living, the name, address, and telephone number of the investigative consumer reporting agency conducting the investigation, the nature and scope of the investigation requested, including a summary of the provisions of Section 1786.22, and the Internet Web site address of the investigative consumer reporting agency identified in clause.

107. Defendants acted in deliberate 0r reckless disregard of its obligations and the rights of its employees and job applicants, including Plaintiff and the ICRAA Subclass. The foregoing violations were willful. Defendants knew or recklessly disregarded the fact that the disclosure form it utilized must include certain information. Defendants acted in deliberate or reckless disregard of its obligations and the rights of Plaintiff and the ICRAA Subclass.

108. As a result of such conduct, Plaintiff and the ICRAA Subclass are entitled to statutory damages of $10,000000 for each and every one of these violations plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

109. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

110. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*., by failing to pay for all hours worked including overtime wages, sick pay wages, by failing to provide all legally required meal and rest periods or pay premium payments at the "regular rate of pay" in lieu thereof, by failing to provide accurate wage statements, failing to reimburse for all necessary

business expenses, by failing to provide the proper disclosures pursuant to the ICRAA, and by failing to pay all earned wages at the time of separation from employment.

111. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

112. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff for herself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

113. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

114. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf of Defendants' current hourly non-exempt employees and to enforce important rights affecting the public interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

<u>ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

115. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

116. Defendants have committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees. Plaintiff Zulma Hernandez ("Plaintiff"), an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*., acting on behalf of himself and other similarly aggrieved employees, brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other similarly aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to (1) $100 for each

initial violation and (2) $200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided based on the following Labor Code violations:

a. Failing to pay Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees for all hours worked, including all minimum and overtime wages in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 1182.12;

b. Failing to provide Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees with all of their statutorily mandated meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194 and 1198;

c. Failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees with all of their statutorily mandated rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, and 516;

d. Failing to furnish Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violations of Labor Code § 226(a)(1)(5)(9);

e. Failing to timely compensate Plaintiff and similarly aggrieved employees with all earnings at their separation of employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203;

f. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Plaintiff and similarly aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code § 1174; and

g. Failing to reimburse Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees for necessary business expenses incurred in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802-2804.

117. On or about November 13, 2023, Plaintiff Zulma Hernandez ("Plaintiff") notified Defendant Ventura Transit System, Inc. ("Defendant"), and the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") via email of Defendant's violations of the California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*., with respect to violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 108 (a)-(g). 65 days have passed since Plaintiff notified the LWDA and Defendant of these violations, and there has been no response from the LWDA. As such, Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

118. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and the interests of similarly aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff has hereby incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
2. For an order-appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 1194, and 1198 and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;
5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, and 1198 and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;
6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 246, 558, 1194.2, 1198, and 1199;
9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(a), and reasonable costs and attorneys' fees;
10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for statutory waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203;
11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for unreimbursed expenses, interest and attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2802-2804;

12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*.;

13. Upon the Tenth Cause of Action, for damages in the amount of $10,000 per violation, please reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Civil Code § 1786.16.

1. Upon the Eleventh Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other similarly aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (a) and (f), including, but not limited to (1) $100.00 for each initial violation and (2) $200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided;

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

15. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226, 1194, 2802, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

16. For such other relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: April 15, 2025

FALAKSSA LAW, P.C.
BOKHOUR LAW GROUP, P.C.

By: ______________________

Joshua Falakassa, Esq.
Mehrdad Bokhour, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Classes

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the action; my business address is 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 920, Los Angeles, California 90067.

On April 15, 2025, I served the following document(s) described as **FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action:

Nicole Golob, Esq.
ngolob@fisherphillips.com
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP
21600 Oxnard Street, Suite 650
Woodland Hills, California 91367

Joel Moon, Esq.
jmoon@fisherphillips.com
Melissa A. Huether, Esq.
mhuether@fisherphillips.com
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP
444 South Flower Street, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, California 90071

Counsel for defendant
VENTURA TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.

BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE: I transmitted the above-referenced document(s) via electronic service provider First Legal to the person(s) identified above at the email address(es) indicated and did not, within a reasonable time after transmission, receive any message or communication indicating that delivery failed or that any other error had occurred which would delay or caused failure in transmission and delivery of the document and/or any attachments thereto.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on April 15, 2025, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Carlos Garcia
Carlos Garcia