Shaun Setareh (SBN 204514)
Thomas Segal (SBN 222791)
Eric Hahn (SBN 311771)
SETAREH LAW GROUP
420 N. Camden Dr., Suite 100
Beverly Hills, California 90210
Telephone (310) 888-7771
Facsimile (310) 888-0109
Email: shaun@setarehlaw.com
Email: thomas@setarehlaw.com
Email: eric@setarehlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff SEAN BROWNELL

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
10/14/2026 7:13:56 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By A. Ramirez ,Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

SEAN BROWNELL, on behalf of himself and all other current and former non-exempt employees, and the general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

BAKER ELECTRIC & RENEWABLES LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 26CU055047C

CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

COMPLAINT

1. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198);
3. Failure to Pay Hourly Wages (Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1997.1 and 1198);
4. Failure to Pay Vacation Wages (Lab. Code § 227.3);
5. Failure to Provide Accurate Written Wage Statements (Lab. Code §§ 226(a));
6. Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203);
7. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*);
8. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff SEAN BROWNELL ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and all other current and former non-exempt employees, and the general public, complains and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff brings this action against defendants BAKER ELECTRIC & RENEWABLES LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively referred to as "Defendants") for alleged violations of the Labor Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have

(1) failed to provide Plaintiff and all other similarly situated individuals with meal periods;

(2) failed to provide them with rest periods;

(3) failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and/or rest periods;

(4) failed to pay them at least minimum wage for all hours worked;

(5) failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;

(6) failed to pay them for all vested vacation pay;

(7) failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements; and

(8) failed to pay them all of their final wages following separation of employment.

Based on these alleged violations, Plaintiff now brings this action to recover unpaid wages, restitution, civil and statutory penalties, and related relief on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, all other aggrieved employees, and the State of California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the unpaid wages, actual damages, liquidated damages, restitution, and penalties sought by Plaintiff from Defendants exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court of the State of California.

3. Venue is proper in COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose there, because at least some of the transactions that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found, maintains offices, transacts business, and/or has an agent therein.

///

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff is and was, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, an individual residing in the State of California.

5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendant BAKER ELECTRIC & RENEWABLES LLC is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California limited liability company doing business in the State of California.

6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged herein and that Plaintiff's alleged damages were proximately caused by these defendants, and each of them. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege both the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when ascertained.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times mentioned herein, some or all of the defendants were the representatives, agents, employees, partners, directors, associates, joint venturers, joint employers, principals, or co-participants of some or all of the other defendants, and, in doing the things alleged herein, were acting within the course and scope of such relationship and with the full knowledge, consent, and ratification by such other defendants.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

8. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382, because there is a well-defined community of interest among the persons who comprise the readily ascertainable classes defined below and because Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in managing this case as a class action.

9. **Relevant Time Period**: The relevant time period is defined as the time period beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until judgment is entered.

Hourly Employee Class: All persons employed by Defendants whether directly or indirectly through any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in hourly or non-exempt positions in California during the **Relevant Time Period**.

Meal Period Sub-Class: All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked in a shift in excess of five hours during the **Relevant Time Period**.

Rest Period Sub-Class: All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked a shift of at least three and one-half (3.5) hours during the **Relevant Time Period**.

Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class: All **Hourly Employee Class** members employed by Defendants in California during the period beginning one year before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is entered.

Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class: All **Hourly Employee Class** members who separated from their employment with Defendants during the period beginning three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is entered.

UCL Class: All **Hourly Employee Class** members employed by Defendants in California during the **Relevant Time Period**.

Vacation Pay Class: All persons employed by Defendants in California who earned paid vacation days, including but not limited to, "Floating Holidays," without receiving compensation for each vested paid vacation day during the **Relevant Time Period**.

10. **Reservation of Rights**: Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class definitions with greater specificity by further division into sub-classes and/or by limitation to particular issues.

11. **Numerosity**: The class members are so numerous that the individual joinder of each individual class member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact number of class members, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that the actual number exceeds the minimum required for numerosity under California law.

12. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all class members and predominate over any questions that affect only individual class members. These common questions include, but are not limited to:

i. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide employees with their meal periods;

ii. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide employees with their rest periods;

iii. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members when they have not been provided with required meal and/or rest periods;

iv. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class members as a result of policies that fail to provide meal periods in accordance with California law;

v. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class members for all time worked;

vi. Whether Defendants subjected the vacation time and/or floating holidays they offer to class members to forfeiture;

vii. Whether Defendants failed to provide class members with accurate written wage statements as a result of providing them with written wage statements with inaccurate entries for, among other things, amounts of gross and net wages, and total hours worked;

viii. Whether Defendants applied policies or practices that result in late and/or incomplete final wage payments;

ix. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under Labor Code section 203; and

x. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition.

13. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other class members' claims. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendants have a policy or practice of failing to comply with the Labor Code and Business and Professions Code as alleged in this Complaint.

14. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative in that he has no interests that are adverse to or otherwise conflict with the interests of absent class members and is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on their behalf. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the other class members.

15. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent class members, are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of Plaintiff and absent class members.

16. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and efficient adjudication of the class members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims simultaneously and efficiently in a single forum without the unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the monetary amounts due to many individual class members are likely to be relatively small and would thus make it difficult, if not impossible, for individual class members to both seek and obtain relief. Moreover, a class action will serve an important public interest by permitting class members to effectively pursue the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will prevent the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

17. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as an hourly, non-exempt employee from approximately November 2024 through September 16, 2025.

Donning and Doffing

18. Plaintiff and the putative class were required to don and doff their work uniforms, consisting of personal protective equipment ("PPE") which included a hard hat, safety vest, and gloves, before clocking in for each shift and/or after clocking out at the end of each shift.

19. The time spent donning or doffing their work uniforms was considered to be on the employee's personal time for which Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not paid.

20. As a result, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees for the time spent donning and doffing their work uniforms.

Off-the-Clock Work

21. Plaintiff and the putative class were not paid all wages earned as Defendants directed, permitted, or otherwise encouraged Plaintiff and the putative class to perform off-the-clock work.

22. Plaintiff and the putative class regularly started work before their scheduled work hours and were not paid for this time. Plaintiff and the putative class performed pre-shift work, including mandatory preparatory tasks, before their recorded start times. This process could take as long as thirty minutes to one hour per day – time which was unpaid by Defendants.

23. Defendants maintain the non-delegable duty to record and pay for all hours worked and may not shift that obligation to employees via paper timesheets that omit pre-shift time. By relying on those incomplete timesheets despite knowing or having reason to know pre-shift work was performed, Defendants failed to pay for compensable time.

24. As a result of performing off-the-clock work that was directed, permitted, or otherwise encouraged by Defendants, Plaintiff and the putative class should have been paid for this time. Instead, Defendants only paid Plaintiff and the putative class based on the time recorded on their timesheets and did not pay Plaintiff and the putative class for any of the time spent working off-the-clock.

25. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the putative class were performing work before and after their scheduled work shifts and failed to pay Plaintiff and the putative class for these hours.

26. Defendants were aware of this practice and directed, permitted, or otherwise encouraged Plaintiff and the putative class to perform off-the-clock work.

27. As a result of Defendants' policies and practices, Plaintiff and the putative class were not paid for all hours worked.

Improper Rounding Practices

28. Defendants utilize and utilized, at all relevant times herein, a rounding practice that is not and was not "fair and neutral" and that results and resulted in a failure to pay employees over a period of time.

29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendants have not, did not, and do not keep records of actual hours worked by Plaintiff and the putative class. In the absence of records showing actual hours worked, Plaintiff and the putative class are unable to ascertain whether (1) Defendants' rounding practices comply with California law; (2) whether Defendants' rounding practices resulted over a period of time, in failure to compensate Plaintiff and the putative class properly for all the time they actually worked; and (3) whether Plaintiff and the putative class were properly paid for all hours worked.

30. Plaintiff's paystubs reflected work time only in whole and half-hour increments, with no minutes recorded. Defendants did not maintain timeclocks on the premises and instead required Plaintiff and the putative class to record their time on paper timesheets. Although employees had badges with QR codes capable of capturing time electronically, Defendants instead relied on the paper entries. Defendants rounded Plaintiff's and the putative class members' start and stop times to whole and half-hour increments rather than recording actual minutes worked, resulting in employees losing compensable time and being underpaid wages.

Missed Meal Periods and Auto-Deduct

31. During their employment with Defendants, Plaintiff and the putative class regularly worked shifts of eight to twelve hours per day, without being afforded a meal break during the first five hours, and/or a second meal break after ten hours, as required by California law. Defendants had a policy of automatically deducting thirty minutes from Plaintiff's and the putative class's paychecks, regardless of whether Plaintiff and the putative class received a meal period or not.

32. Plaintiff and the putative class were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; (2) chronically understaffing each work shift with not enough workers; (3) imposing so much work on each employee such that it made it unlikely that an employee would be able to take their breaks if they wanted to finish their work on time; and (4) no formal written meal and rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their meal and rest periods.

33. Plaintiff and the putative class regularly continued working during purported meal periods breaks, performing job duties including, but not limited to, assisting colleagues working on the field site.

34. As a result of Defendants' policy, Plaintiff and the putative class were regularly not provided with uninterrupted meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hours worked due to complying with Defendants' productivity requirements that required Plaintiff and the putative class to work through their meal periods in order to complete their assignments on time.

Missed Rest Periods

35. Plaintiff and the putative class were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift; (2) chronically understaffing each work shift with not enough workers; (3) imposing so much work on each employee such that it made it unlikely that an employee would be able to take their breaks if they wanted to finish their work on time; and (4) no formal written meal and rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their meal and rest periods.

36. On many occasions, rest periods were interrupted, shortened, and/or entirely missed as Plaintiff and the putative class continued working during purported rest periods, performing job duties including, but not limited to, assisting colleagues working on the field site. For instance, Plaintiff often went to the office during his rest periods to respond to emails and other work-related communications.

37. As a result of Defendants' policy, Plaintiff and the putative class were regularly not provided with uninterrupted rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hours worked due to complying with Defendants' productivity requirements that required Plaintiff and the putative class to work through their rest periods in order to complete their assignments on time.

Vacation Pay

38. Plaintiff and the putative class accrued vacation wages during their employment with Defendants.

39. Vacation wages are considered a form of wages under Labor Code § 200. Vested vacation pay and other similar forms of paid time off earned based on labor performed are considered wages that cannot be subject to forfeiture without compensation for forfeited days at the applicable rates required by law.

40. At all relevant times, Defendants maintained policies that provide for the unlawful forfeiture of vested vacation pay in violation of Labor Code § 227.3 and *Suastez v. Plastic Dress-Up Co.*, (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 774.

41. Plaintiff and the putative class are entitled to vacation accrued during their employment with Defendants. Upon termination, Plaintiff and the putative class were not paid all accrued vacation pay.

Wage Statements

42. Plaintiff and the putative class were not provided with accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code § 226.

43. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code 0167 226(a)(1) as "gross wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and "off-the-clock" work were not included.

44. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as "total hours worked by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and "off-the-clock" work were not included.

45. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as "net wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and "off-the-clock" work were not included.

46. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as "all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that all hours worked, including overtime and "off-the-clock" work were not included.

///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS

(Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198)

(Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class)

47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

48. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members have been non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full meal period protections of both the Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("Wage Order").

49. Labor Code § 512 and § 11 of the applicable Wage Order impose an affirmative obligation on employers to provide non-exempt employees with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period of five hours, and to provide them with two uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period of ten hours.

50. Labor Code § 226.7 and § 11 of the applicable Wage Order both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work during required meal periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of premium wages on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required meal period.

51. Compensation for missed meal periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor Code § 200.

52. Labor Code § 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

53. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:

> "No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an 'on duty' meal period and counted as time worked. An 'on duty' meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time."

54. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was not subject to a valid on-duty meal period agreement. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not subject to valid on-duty meal period agreements with Defendants.

55. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period, as required by Labor Code § 512 and the applicable Wage Order.

56. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to pay premium wages to **Meal Period Sub-Class** members when they worked five (5) hours without clocking out for any meal period.

57. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of automatically deducting one-half hour for a meal period from the paychecks of **Meal Period Sub-Class** members on each day they worked, regardless of whether or not they were able to take an uninterrupted, duty-free meal period.

58. Moreover, Defendants' written policies do not provide that employees must take their first meal period before the end of the fifth hour of work, that employees are entitled to a second meal period if they work a shift of over ten hours, or that the second meal period must commence before the end of the tenth hour of work, unless waived.

59. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members additional premium wages, and/or were not paid premium wages at the employees' regular rates of pay when required meal periods were not provided.

60. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seek to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and costs of suit.

61. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS

(Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198)

(Plaintiff and Rest Period Sub-Class)

62. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

63. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class** members have been non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full rest period protections of both the Labor Code and the applicable Wage Order.

64. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order imposes an affirmative obligation on employers to permit and authorize employees to take required rest periods at a rate of no less than ten minutes of net rest time for each four-hour work period, or major fraction thereof, that must be in the middle of each work period insofar as practicable.

65. Labor Code § 226.7 and § 12 of the applicable Wage Order both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work during required rest periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of premium wages at the employees' regular rates of pay, on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required rest period(s).

66. Compensation for missed rest periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor Code § 200.

67. Labor Code § 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that violate the Wage Order.

68. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing members of the **Rest Period Sub-Class** with net rest period of at least ten minutes for each four-hour work period, or major fraction thereof, as required by the applicable Wage Order.

69. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class** members additional premium wages when required rest periods were not provided.

70. Specifically, Defendants written policies do not provide that employees may take a rest period for each four hours worked, or major fraction thereof, nor that rest periods should be taken in the middle of each work period insofar as practicable.

71. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and costs of suit.

72. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES

(Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1197 and 1198)

(Plaintiff and Hourly Employee Class)

73. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

74. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members are or have been non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full protections of the Labor Code and the applicable Wage Order.

75. Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of the employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so."

76. Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt employees at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consists of all hours that an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

77. Labor Code § 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under the applicable Wage Order.

78. Labor Code § 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover liquidated damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon in addition to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon.

79. Labor Code § 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a payroll period.

80. Labor Code § 1197.1 provides that it is unlawful for any employer or any other person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person to pay an employee, or cause an employee to be paid, less than the applicable minimum wage.

81. Labor Code § 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ employees under conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

82. Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay non-exempt employees their earned wages for the normal work period at least twice during each calendar month on days the employer designates in advance and to pay non-exempt employees their earned wages for labor performed in excess of the normal work period by no later than the next regular payday.

83. Labor Code § 223 makes it unlawful for employers to pay their employees lower wages than required by contract or statute while purporting to pay them legal wages.

84. Labor Code § 510 and § 3 of the applicable Wage Order require employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than one and one-half times the employees' respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in one workday, all hours worked in excess of forty hours in one workweek, and for the first eight hours worked on the seventh consecutive day of one workweek.

85. Labor Code § 510 and § 3 of the applicable Wage Order also require employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than two times the employees' respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve hours in one workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight hours on a seventh consecutive workday during the workweek.

86. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, Defendants have applied centrally devised policies and practices to him and **Hourly Employee Class** members with respect to working conditions and compensation arrangements.

87. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay hourly wages to Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime hours at statutory and/or agreed rates.

88. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of automatically deducting one-half hour from Plaintiff's timecard on every workday for a meal period, regardless of whether or not Plaintiff was provided with a meal period.

89. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of automatically deducting one-half hour from **Hourly Employee Class** members' timecard on every workday for a meal period, regardless of whether or not **Hourly Employee Class** members were provided with a meal period.

90. As a result of Defendants' policy or practice of automatically deducting one-half hour from employees' timecards for every workday for a meal period, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they were working.

91. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay hourly wages to Plaintiff for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime wages at statutory and/or agreed rates by suffering or permitting her to work during unpaid meal periods and/or failing to properly pay Plaintiff for all overtime hours worked.

92. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not paying hourly wages to **Hourly Employee Class** members for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime hours at statutory and/or agreed rates by suffering or permitting them to work during unpaid meal periods.

93. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay hourly wages to Plaintiff for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime wages at statutory and/or agreed rates by suffering or

permitting him to work off-the-clock while putting on and taking off protective and/or sanitary gear over his clothing.

94. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not paying hourly wages to **Hourly Employee Class** members for all time worked, including but not limited to overtime wages, at statutory and/or agreed rates by suffering or permitting them to work off-the-clock while putting on and taking off protective and/or sanitary gear over their clothing.

95. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members all earned wages every pay period at the correct rates, including overtime rates, because Defendants directed, permitted, or otherwise encouraged Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to perform off-the-clock work.

96. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members have suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid the full amount of wages earned during each pay period during the applicable limitations period, including overtime wages.

97. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 218.6, 223, 510, 1194 and 1194.2, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid straight time and overtime wages, interest thereon, and costs of suit.

98. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY VACATION WAGES

(Lab. Code § 227.3)

(Plaintiff and Vacation Pay Class)

99. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

100. California Labor Code section 227.3 provides:

> Unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated representative, in the resolution of any dispute with regard to vested vacation time, shall apply the principles of equity and fairness.

101. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and members of the **Vacation Pay Class** accrued vacation time during their employment with Defendants.

102. As a result of Defendants' reimbursement policies and practices, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants failed to reimburse him and **Vacation Pay Class** members for all accrued vacation wages.

103. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the members of the **Vacation Pay Class** are entitled to restitution for all unpaid amounts due and owing to within four years (4) of the date of the filing of the original Complaint until the date of entry of judgment.

104. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the members of the **Vacation Pay Class**, seeks interest thereon pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6, costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS

(Lab. Code § 226)

(Plaintiff and Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class)

105. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

106. Labor Code § 226(a) states:

> 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, except as provided in subdivision (j), (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, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of 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 and, beginning July 1, 2013, if the employer is a temporary services employer as defined in Section 201.3, the rate of pay and the total hours worked for each temporary services assignment. The deductions made from payment of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement and the record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California. For purposes of this subdivision, 'copy' includes a duplicate of the itemized statement provided to an employee or a computer-generated record that accurately shows all of the information required by this subdivision.

107. The Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("DLSE") has sought to harmonize the "detachable part of the check" provision and the "accurate itemized statement in writing" provision of Labor Code section 226(a) by allowing for electronic wage statements so long as each employee retains the right to elect to receive a written paper stub or record and that those who are provided with electronic wage statements retain the ability to easily access the information and convert the electronic statements into hard copies at no expense to the employee. (DLSE Opinion Letter July 6, 2006.)

108. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants have failed to provide **Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class** members with written wage statements as described above.

109. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failure to provide him and **Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class** members with accurate written wage statements were intentional in that Defendants had the ability to provide them with accurate wage statements but had intentionally provided them with written wage statements that Defendants knew do not comply with Labor Code § 226(a).

110. Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class** members have suffered injuries, in that Defendants have violated Plaintiff's and **Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class** members' legal rights to receive accurate wage statements and have misled them about their actual rates of pay

and wages earned. In addition, inaccurate information on their wage statements have prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed, has caused difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records, and/or has led to the submission of inaccurate information about wages and deductions to federal and state government agencies.

111. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e), Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class** members, seeks the greater of actual damages or fifty dollars ($50.00) for the initial pay period in which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred and one hundred dollars ($100.00) for each subsequent pay period in which a violation of Labor Code § 226(a) occurred, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000.00) per class member.

112. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class** members, seek awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL FINAL WAGES

(Lab. Code §§ 201–203)

(Plaintiff and Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class)

113. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

114. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members have been entitled, upon the end of their employment with Defendants, to timely payment of all wages earned and unpaid before termination or resignation.

115. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code § 201, employees who have been discharged have been entitled to payment of all final wages immediately upon termination.

116. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code § 202, employees who have resigned after giving at least seventy-two (72) hours' notice of resignation have been entitled to payment of all final wages at the time of resignation.

117. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code § 202, employees who have resigned after giving less than seventy-two (72) hours' notice of resignation have been entitled to payment of all final wages within seventy-two (72) hours' of giving notice of resignation.

118. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all of his final wages in accordance with the Labor Code by failing to timely pay him all of his final wages.

119. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants have failed to timely pay **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members all of their final wages in accordance with the Labor Code.

120. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants have maintained a policy or practice of paying **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members their final wages without regard to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201 or 202 by failing to timely pay them all final wages.

121. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendants' failure to timely pay all final wages to him and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members have been willful in that Defendants have the ability to pay final wages in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202 but have intentionally adopted policies or practices that are incompatible with those requirements.

122. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 203 and 218.6, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members, seeks waiting time penalties from the respective dates that their final wages had first become due until paid, up to a maximum of thirty days, and interest thereon.

123. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members, seek awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

///

///

///

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq*.)

(Plaintiff and UCL Class)

124. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

125. Business and Professions Code § 17200 defines "unfair competition" to include any unlawful business practice.

126. Business and Professions Code §§ 17203–17204 allow a person who has lost money or property as a result of unfair competition to bring a class action in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure § 382 to recover money or property that may have been acquired from similarly situated persons by means of unfair competition.

127. California law requires employers to pay hourly, non-exempt employees for all hours they are permitted or suffered to work, including hours that the employer knows or reasonably should know that employees have worked.

128. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the **UCL Class** members, re-alleges and incorporates the FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH, FIFTH, and SIXTH causes of action herein.

129. Plaintiff lost money and/or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair competition.

130. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair competition.

131. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that, by committing the Labor Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 215, 216, 225, 226.6, 553, 1175, 1199 and 2802. Defendants thus committed misdemeanors by violating the Labor Code as alleged herein.

132. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and practices of, *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an employer to: provide non-exempt employees with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period of five or more hours; provide non-exempt employees with rest periods of at least ten

minutes for each four-hour work period; pay non-exempt employees for all hours worked; pay vacation wages; provide accurate written wage statements; and timely pay all final wages.

133. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members have been non-exempt employees and entitled to the full protections of both the Labor Code and the applicable Wage Order.

134. Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged in this Complaint amounts to and constitutes unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et sequitur*. Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et sequitur* protect against unfair competition and allow a person who has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property as a result of an unfair, unlawful, or fraudulent business practice to seek restitution on behalf of himself and on behalf of similarly situated persons in a class-action proceeding.

135. As a result of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property in the form of earned wages. Specifically, Plaintiff has lost money or property as a result of Defendants' conduct.

136. Plaintiff is informed and believes that other similarly situated persons have been subject to the same unlawful policies or practices of Defendants.

137. Due to the unfair and unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code, Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in the State of California that comply with their legal obligations.

138. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") permits civil recovery and injunctive relief for "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice," including a practice or act that violates, or is considered unlawful under, any other state or federal law.

139. Accordingly, pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 and 17203, Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and upon a final hearing, an order permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and

employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders.

140. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **UCL Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful and unfair business practices.

141. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

(Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq*.)

142. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

143. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

144. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not, be brought or maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

145. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c).

146. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code § 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an intent to investigate.

147. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1198:

i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 212, 226.7, 227.3, 1194, and 1198, one hundred dollars ($100) for each employee per pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee per pay period for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));

ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty (30) days' pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);

iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars ($100) for each employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);

iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars ($100) for each employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 225.5);

v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial citation, two hundred and fifty dollars ($250) for each employee for each violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before the filing of this action, one thousand dollars ($1,000) for each employee for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);

vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars ($50) for each employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid, and one hundred dollars ($100) for each employee for each subsequent pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code § 558);

vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars ($250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1);

viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

///

///

///

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all other current and former non-exempt employees, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

(1) An order that the action be certified as a class action;

(2) An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;

(3) An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;

(4) Unpaid wages;

(5) Actual damages;

(6) Liquidated damages;

(7) Restitution;

(8) Declaratory relief;

(9) Pre-judgment interest;

(10) Statutory penalties;

(11) Civil penalties;

(12) Costs of suit;

(13) Reasonable attorneys' fees; and

(14) Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all other current and former non-exempt employees, and the general public, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: October 14, 2026

SETAREH LAW GROUP

/s/ Shaun Setareh
SHAUN SETAREH
THOMAS SEGAL
ERIC HAHN
Attorneys for Plaintiff
SEAN BROWNELL