

PRISCILLA GAMINO, SBN 315404
priscilla@protectionlawgroup.com
BRENDAN J. BURTON, SBN 323495
brendan@protectionlawgroup.com
ONYEBUCHI OKEKE, SBN 338730
buchi@protectionlawgroup.com
PROTECTION LAW GROUP, LLP
237 California Street
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel.: (424) 290-3095 / Fax: (866) 264-7880

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
JOSE ANTONIO IBARRA MARTINEZ and
RAUL AMADOR

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MADERA

JOSE ANTONIO IBARRA MARTINEZ,
individually and on behalf of others similarly
situated, and as an aggrieved employee and
Private Attorney General; RAUL
AMADOR, individually and on behalf of
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FRUIT HARVEST FAMILY, INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through
50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: MCV090949

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

- (1) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)
- (2) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums)
- (3) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums)
- (4) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages)
- (5) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid)
- (6) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204 and 210 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment)
- (7) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a) (Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements)
- (8) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses)
- (9) Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.
- (10) Violation of Cal. Labor Code 2699, (Private Attorneys General Act)

1 Plaintiffs JOSE ANTONIO IBARRA MARTINEZ and RAUL AMADOR (collectively
2 “Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated,
3 based upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support
4 after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery, allege as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 1. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendant FRUIT HARVEST FAMILY, INC.
7 and DOES 1 THROUGH 50 (hereinafter also collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for
8 California Labor Code violations, unfair business practices, and civil penalties stemming from
9 Defendants’ failure to pay overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to
10 authorize and permit rest periods, failure to pay minimum wage, failure to timely pay wages,
11 failure to provide accurate wage statements, failure to maintain accurate time and payroll records,
12 and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses.

13 2. Plaintiffs’ First through Ninth Causes of Action are brought as a class action on
14 behalf of themselves and similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants
15 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” as defined more fully in
16 paragraph 14, below) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary
17 damages and restitution sought by Plaintiffs exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior
18 Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

19 3. Plaintiff Martinez’s Tenth Cause of Action is brought as a representative action on
20 behalf of himself and certain other current and former employees of Defendants against whom
21 one or more of the alleged violations was committed (hereinafter collectively referred to as the
22 “Aggrieved Employees”) pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* Plaintiff
23 Martinez is an aggrieved employee against whom one or more of the alleged violations occurred.
24 The civil penalties sought by Plaintiff Martinez exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the
25 Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

26 4. The Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to the California Constitution,
27 Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes”
28

except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this Action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

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

6. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Madera.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff JOSE ANTONIO IBARRA MARTINEZ is an individual residing in the State of California.

8. Plaintiff RAUL AMADOR is an individual residing in the State of California.

9. Defendant FRUIT HARVEST FAMILY, INC. is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and registered to do business in the state of California.

10. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the identities of defendants Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sue these defendants by such fictitious names. The Doe defendants may be individuals, partnerships, or corporations. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that, at all times mentioned herein, each of the Doe defendants was the parent, subsidiary, agent, servant, employee, co-venturer, and/or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and was at all times mentioned acting within the scope, purpose, consent, knowledge, ratification and authorization of such agency, employment, joint venture and conspiracy. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each of the fictitiously named Doe defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that Plaintiffs' damages as herein alleged

were proximately caused by its conduct. FRUIT HARVEST FAMILY, INC. and Doe Defendants 1 through 50 are collectively referred to herein as “Defendants.”

11. Defendants are, and at all times herein mentioned were, (a) conducting business in the County of Madera, State of California, and (b) the employer of Plaintiffs consistent with the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“Wage Orders”).

12. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers jointly liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

13. Plaintiffs bring the First through Ninth Causes of Action as a class action on their own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seek class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

14. The proposed class is defined as follows: All current and former non-exempt employees of any of the Defendants within the State of California at any time commencing four (4) years preceding the filing of Plaintiffs’ complaint up until the time that notice of the certified class action is provided to the class (hereinafter referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members.”).

15. Plaintiffs reserve the right to establish other subclasses as appropriate.

16. The Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all Class Members is impracticable. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be over fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants’ employment records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiffs’ claims are typical of all other Class Members demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other Class

Members with whom they have a well-defined community of interest.

c. Adequacy: Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member, with whom they have a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs have no interest that is antagonistic to the other Class Members. Plaintiffs' attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiffs have incurred, and during the pendency of this Action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each Class Member.

d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all Class Members is impractical.

e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the Class Members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

17. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the Class:

a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement, or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code was willful;

b. Whether Defendants had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all hours worked, and missed, short, late or interrupted meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;

- 1 c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to work
2 more than eight (8) hours per day and/or more than forty (40) hours per week and
3 failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiffs and the other
4 Class Members;
- 5 d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiffs and the other Class Members of meal
6 and/or rest periods or required Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to work
7 during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- 8 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay meal period premium wages to Class Members
9 when they were not provided with a legally compliant meal period;
- 10 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay rest period premium wages to Class Members
11 when they were not authorized and permitted to take legally compliant rest
12 periods;
- 13 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the other
14 Class Members for all hours worked;
- 15 h. Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the
16 required minimum wage pursuant to California law;
- 17 i. Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members proper
18 overtime compensation pursuant to California law;
- 19 j. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other Class
20 Members within the time required upon their discharge or resignation from
21 employment;
- 22 k. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class Members
23 for all necessary business-related expenses and costs in violation of California
24 Labor Code section 2802;
- 25 l. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other
26 Class Members during their employment;
- 27 m. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California
28

Labor Code, including section 226;

n. Whether Defendants' conduct was with malice, fraud, or oppression;

o. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;

p. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* based on their improper withholding of compensation and deduction of wages;

q. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and

r. Whether Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

18. Defendants are a wholesale fruit harvester providing fruit to companies and individuals throughout California.

19. Defendants employed Plaintiff Martinez to work as a Laborer from approximately January 1, 2023, to approximately April 6, 2023.

20. Defendants employed Plaintiff Amador to work as a Laborer from approximately May 2021, to approximately October 2022.

21. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees.

22. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees; to directly or indirectly control work rules, working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees; and to hire and terminate the employment of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

23. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

24. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants engaged

1 in an ongoing and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt
2 employees. As set forth in more detail below, this scheme involved, *inter alia*, regularly requiring
3 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation,
4 thereby failing to pay them for all hours worked, including minimum and overtime wages. In
5 addition, Defendants routinely failed to permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
6 to take timely and duty-free meal periods and rest periods in violation of California law.
7 Defendants also failed to reimburse Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all
8 necessary business-related expenses.

9 25. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented
10 policies and practices which failed to provide Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
11 with timely and duty-free meal periods. Defendants routinely failed to relieve Plaintiffs, the Class,
12 and the Aggrieved Employees of all duties during their meal periods, regularly failed to relinquish
13 control over Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees during their meal periods,
14 regularly failed to permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees a reasonable
15 opportunity to take their meal periods, and regularly impeded or discouraged Plaintiffs, the Class,
16 and the Aggrieved Employees from taking thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal breaks no later
17 than the end of their fifth hour of work and/or from taking a second thirty (30) minute
18 uninterrupted meal break no later than their tenth hour of work for shifts lasting more than ten
19 (10) hours. Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of meal periods taken by Plaintiffs,
20 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

21 26. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants did not adequately
22 inform Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take meal periods
23 under California law. Moreover, Defendants systematically disregarded their own written policies
24 regarding the provision and timing of meal periods for Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
25 Employees. Instead, Defendants' actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiffs, the Class,
26 and the Aggrieved Employees in a way that prohibited them from taking timely and duty-free
27 meal periods, and to require Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work through
28

1 their meal periods, for which they were not compensated.

2 27. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay
3 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for meal periods that were
4 missed, late, interrupted, or shortened in violation of California law. Defendants knew or should
5 have known that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all
6 meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a meal
7 period was missed, short, late, and/or interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants
8 routinely failed to provide legally compliant meal periods to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
9 Aggrieved Employees and routinely failed to pay one additional hour of pay to Plaintiffs, the
10 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed,
11 short, late, and/or interrupted.

12 28. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants have implemented
13 policies and practices which prohibited Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees from
14 taking timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants regularly failed to provide, authorize, and
15 permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take full, uninterrupted, off-duty rest
16 periods for every shift lasting three and one-half (3.5) to six (6) hours and/or two full,
17 uninterrupted, off-duty rest periods for every shift lasting six (6) to ten (10) hours, and failed to
18 make a good faith effort to authorize, permit, and provide such rest breaks in the middle of each
19 work period.

20 29. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants did not adequately
21 inform Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take rest periods under
22 California law. Moreover, Defendants systematically disregarded their own written policies
23 regarding the provision and timing of rest periods for Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
24 Employees. Instead, Defendants' actual policy and practice was to schedule Plaintiffs, the Class,
25 and the Aggrieved Employees in a way that regularly prohibited them from taking timely and
26 duty-free rest periods, and to regularly require Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
27 to work through their rest periods.

1 30. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay
2 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages for rest periods that were
3 missed, late, interrupted, or shortened in violation of California law. Defendants knew or should
4 have known that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all
5 rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period
6 was missed, short, late, and/or interrupted. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants routinely
7 failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take duty-
8 free rest periods, and failed to pay one additional hour of pay to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
9 Aggrieved Employees at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, short, late, and/or
10 interrupted.

11 31. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly required
12 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Although
13 Defendants prohibited overtime, Defendants still regularly required that Plaintiffs, the Class, and
14 the Aggrieved Employees complete all of their assigned duties. To do so, Plaintiffs, the Class,
15 and the Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to perform work off-the-clock for which
16 they were not compensated.

17 32. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
18 Aggrieved Employees worked more than eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a
19 week.

20 33. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
21 pay all overtime compensation owed to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees when
22 they worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a single work day and/or forty (40) hours in a single
23 work week, or in excess of twelve (12) hours in a single work day and/or eighty (80) hours in a
24 single work week. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
25 Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that
26 they were not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

27 34. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to pay
28

overtime to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

35. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at least minimum wages for all hours worked. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive at least minimum wages for all hours worked and that they were not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages included, *inter alia*, failing to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at the required minimum wage pursuant to California law, requiring Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock.

36. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them upon termination within the time permissible under California Labor Code section 202. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive payment of all final wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime compensation and minimum wages within any time permissible under California Labor Code section 202.

37. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees all wages within any time permissible under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime compensation, minimum wages, meal and rest period premiums.

38. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved

1 Employees. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
2 Employees were entitled to receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with
3 California law, but, in fact, they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from
4 Defendants. The deficiencies included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours
5 worked, the actual gross wages earned, the correct rates of pay, and number of piece-rate units
6 paid and any applicable piece rate.

7 39. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
8 keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.
9 Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants were required to keep complete and
10 accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in accordance
11 with California law, but, in fact, did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

12 40. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants regularly failed to
13 maintain accurate records relating to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees work
14 periods, meal periods, total daily hours, hours per pay period, applicable pay rates, and number
15 of piece-rate units paid and any applicable piece rate.

16 41. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants failed to reimburse
17 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses,
18 including but not limited to expenses for proper footwear and/or tools purchases. Defendants
19 knew or should have known that Defendants were required to reimburse Plaintiffs, the Class, and
20 the Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses and costs, but, in fact, failed
21 to do so in violation of California law.

22 42. Throughout the time period involved in this case, Defendants knew or should have
23 known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
24 pursuant to California law. Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but
25 willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiffs, the
26 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees that they paid all wages owed to them, all in order to increase
27 Defendants' profits.
28

43. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to “sue directly ... for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this article.”

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)

(Against All Defendants)

44. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above.

45. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

46. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members employed by Defendants, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

47. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiffs and the Class overtime compensation at a rate of two times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh day of work in a workweek.

48. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and no overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

49. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members regularly

1 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

2 50. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to
3 pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members.

4 51. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the unpaid
5 balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of
6 California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

7 52. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiffs and the other Class
8 Members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and
9 attorneys' fees.

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 53. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and
14 every allegation set forth above.

15 54. At all relevant times, the relevant IWC Order and California Labor Code sections
16 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' employment by
17 Defendants.

18 55. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no
19 employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an
20 applicable order of the California IWC.

21 56. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
22 section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work
23 for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal
24 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the
25 employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of
26 both the employer and employee.

27 57. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 512(a) further provides that
28

1 an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more
2 than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal
3 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than
4 twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and
5 the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

6 58. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who were
7 scheduled to work for a period of time longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their
8 legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than
9 five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

10 59. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who were
11 scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of ten (10) hours were required to work for
12 periods longer than ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than
13 thirty (30) minutes.

14 60. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required
15 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to miss their meal periods and to take meal periods that
16 were late, shortened, or interrupted, and failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other Class
17 Members the full meal period premium for missed, shortened, late, or interrupted meal periods.

18 61. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other
19 Class Members the full meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code section
20 226.7.

21 62. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California
22 Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

23 63. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section
24 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
25 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the
26 meal period was not provided.

27 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 64. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and
5 every allegation set forth above.

6 65. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor
7 Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiffs' and the other Class Members' employment by
8 Defendants.

9 66. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no
10 employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable
11 order of the California IWC.

12 67. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very
13 employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as
14 practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be
15 based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4)
16 hours or major fraction thereof unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half
17 (3.5) hours."

18 68. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiffs and other Class
19 Members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest
20 period per each four (4) hour period worked.

21 69. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiffs and the
22 other Class Members to work during rest periods, failed to allow Plaintiffs and the other Class
23 Member to take any rest period and/or failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the other Class
24 Members to take uninterrupted, duty-free rest breaks.

25 70. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other
26 Class Members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7
27 for work performed during rest periods, and/or for failure to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and
28

1 other Class Members from taking uninterrupted rest periods.

2 71. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor
3 Code section 226.7.

4 72. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section
5 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
6 additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday
7 that the rest period was not provided.

8 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)**

10 **(Against All Defendants)**

11 73. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and
12 every allegation set forth above.

13 74. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1
14 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees and the payment of a lesser wage than
15 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

16 75. During the relevant time period, Defendants regularly failed to pay minimum wage
17 to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members as required pursuant to California Labor Code sections
18 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

19 76. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the minimum
20 wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to
21 those sections, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance
22 of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees, and liquidated
23 damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

24 77. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiffs and the other Class
25 Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
26 unpaid and interest thereon.

27 ///

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203)**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 78. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and
5 every allegation set forth above.

6 79. At all relevant times herein set forth, California Labor Code sections 201 and 202
7 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of
8 discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his
9 or her wages shall become due and payable not later seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the
10 employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case
11 the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

12 80. During the relevant time period, the employment of Plaintiffs and many other
13 Class Members with Defendants ended, *i.e.* was terminated by quitting or discharge. Defendants
14 intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiffs and other Class Members who are no longer
15 employed by Defendants all of their wages, earned and unpaid, including but not limited to
16 minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages within seventy-two (72) hours of their
17 leaving Defendants' employ.

18 81. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and other Class Members who are no longer
19 employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their
20 leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

21 82. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to
22 pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall
23 continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action is
24 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

25 83. Plaintiffs and other Class Members who are no longer employed by Defendants
26 are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not
27 paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 204 and 210)**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 84. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and
5 every allegation set forth above.

6 85. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
7 wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any
8 calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable
9 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

10 86. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
11 wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of
12 any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and
13 payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

14 87. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all
15 wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday
16 for the next regular payroll period.

17 88. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to
18 pay Plaintiffs and other Class Members all wages due to them, within any time period permissible
19 under California Labor Code section 204.

20 89. Plaintiffs and other Class Members are entitled to recover all available remedies
21 for Defendants' violations of California Labor Code section 204, including statutory penalties
22 pursuant to Labor Code section 210(b).

23 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))**

25 **(Against All Defendants)**

26 90. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and
27 every allegation set forth above.

1 91. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a)
2 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized
3 statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3)
4 the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a
5 piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
6 employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates
7 of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her social
8 security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all
9 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
10 worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payments of wages shall
11 be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and
12 a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at
13 least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

14 92. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the
15 Class with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, but are not limited
16 to the failure list the total number of hours worked, the actual gross wages earned, the correct
17 rates of pay, and number of piece rate units paid any applicable piece rate.

18 93. Because of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a),
19 Plaintiffs and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

20 94. More specifically, Plaintiffs and the Class have been injured by Defendants'
21 intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were
22 denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and
23 itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

24 95. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their
25 actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code section
26 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

27 96. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance
28

with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)

(Against All Defendants)

97. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above.

98. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

99. Plaintiffs and the Class incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants. Defendants' failure to reimburse for all necessary business-related expenses and costs included their failure to reimburse Plaintiffs and the Class for costs incurred as a result of, including but not limited to, simple negligence.

100. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the Class for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

(Against All Defendants)

101. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein each and every allegation set forth above.

102. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiffs and the Class, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest

1 within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

2 103. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
3 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
4 Code section 17200, *et seq.*

5 104. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* may
6 be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies
7 and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiffs and the Class, to work overtime without
8 paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.
9 Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiffs and
10 the Class, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation
11 violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' policies and
12 practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the Class violate California Labor Code
13 sections 201, 202, 203, and 204.

14 105. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 221, 226(a), 510,
15 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 2800, and 2802.

16 106. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants
17 unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

18 107. Plaintiffs and the Class have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful
19 business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of
20 money and/or property.

21 108. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*,
22 Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
23 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this Complaint; an
24 award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and other
25 applicable laws; and an award of costs.

26 ///

27 ///

1 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 2699, Et Seq.)**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 109. Plaintiff Martinez incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
5 each and every allegation set forth above.

6 110. Plaintiff Martinez brings his tenth cause of action as a representative action on
7 behalf of himself and similarly Aggrieved Employees in the capacity as a private attorney general
8 pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698, *et*
9 *seq.* (“PAGA”).

10 111. PAGA specifically provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties
11 for violations of the Labor Code as follows: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any
12 provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
13 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
14 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through
15 a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current
16 or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.” Cal. Lab. Code §
17 2699(a).

18 112. Plaintiff Martinez was employed by Defendants and the Labor Code violations
19 alleged above were committed against him during his time of employment. Plaintiff Martinez is
20 therefore, an “aggrieved employee” under PAGA.

21 113. As set forth in detail above, during all times relevant to this Action, Defendants
22 have routinely subjected Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved Employees to violations of
23 California Labor Codes by:

- 24 a. Failing to pay Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved Employees all earned
25 minimum wage compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 *et seq.*
26 b. Failing to pay Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime
27 compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198 *et seq.*
28

- 1 c. Failing to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiff Martinez and the
2 Aggrieved Employees, and failing to pay Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved
3 Employees an additional hour of premium pay for meal period violations in
4 violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.
- 5 d. Failing to provide authorize and permit Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved
6 Employees to take duty-free rest periods, and failing to pay Plaintiff Martinez and
7 the Aggrieved Employees an additional hour of premium pay for rest period
8 violations in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.
- 9 e. Failing to timely pay Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
10 at the end of their employment in violation of Labor Code § 203.
- 11 f. Failing to timely pay Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
12 owed during employment in violation of Labor Code § 204.
- 13 g. Failing to furnish Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved Employees with complete,
14 accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226.
- 15 h. Failing to maintain accurate records relating to Plaintiff Martinez and the
16 Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours, hours per
17 pay period, total wages and compensation, and applicable pay rates in violation of
18 Labor Code § 1174(d) and the applicable IWC Wage Order.
- 19 i. Failing to reimburse Plaintiff Martinez and the Aggrieved Employees for
20 necessary business-related expenses in violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802.

21 114. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699 and 2699.5, Plaintiff Martinez,
22 individually and on behalf of the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California, requests and
23 is entitled to recover penalties against Defendants for the Labor Code violations described above,
24 including but not limited to penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 sections 11080
25 penalties under California Labor Code sections 2699, 558, 210, 1197.1, 225.5, 226, 226.3 and
26 1174.5, and 1197.1, and any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California
27 Labor Code and/or other statutes. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an
28

amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

115. Plaintiff Martinez has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3. On December 13, 2023, Plaintiff Martinez, through his counsel of record, by online filing with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to the Defendants, notified Defendants and the LWDA of the specific provisions of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders that Defendants have violated, including the facts and theories to support the violations, and of Plaintiff Martinez’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under PAGA. Plaintiff Martinez also paid the filing fee required under Labor Code § 2699.3. As of the filing of this Complaint, more than sixty-five (65) days have elapsed since the mailing of Plaintiff Martinez’s December 13, 2023, notice, and the LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate the violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff Martinez may commence a civil action to recover penalties for himself and other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3.

116. Plaintiff Martinez was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and the Aggrieved Employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff Martinez therefore seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), and any other applicable statute.

117. Plaintiff Martinez may amend this complaint as a matter of right pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3 as this complaint has been filed within sixty days of the time periods specified in Labor Code §2699.3.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and Plaintiff Martinez as a private attorney general, pray for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this Action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as the representatives of the Class;

3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel; and

4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current/last known contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

As to the First Cause of Action

5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiffs and other Class Members;

6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194; and

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiffs and the Class;

11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiffs and the Class of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7;

14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

1 15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

2 16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

3 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

4 17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
5 Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest
6 periods to Plaintiffs and the Class;

7 18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiffs and the Class of one (1) hour of pay at
8 each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not
9 provided;

10 19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
11 proof;

12 20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7;

13 21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
14 due; and

15 22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

16 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

17 23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
18 Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to
19 Plaintiffs and the Class;

20 24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be
21 appropriate;

22 25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for
23 Plaintiffs and the Class in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

24 26. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts
25 were due;

26 27. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
27 California Labor Code section 1194(a);
28

28. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiffs and other Class Members no longer employed by Defendants;

31. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

32. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for Plaintiffs and other Class Members who have left Defendants' employ;

33. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiffs and the Class;

36. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 210; and

37. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

38. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiffs and the Class, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

39. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

40. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e); and

41. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eight Cause of Action

42. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the Class for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

43. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

44. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

45. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

46. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

47. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiffs and the Class all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiffs and the Class, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the Class, failing to pay Plaintiffs' and other Class Members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202, and 204 and by violating California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800, and 2802;

48. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and the Class and all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

49. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;

50. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

51. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California

Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

52. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

53. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 2699(g)(1) of California Labor Code;

54. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, 210, 558, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and all other penalties allowed by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes; and

55. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 20, 2024

PROTECTION LAW GROUP, LLP

By: 

Priscilla Gamino
Brendan J. Burton
Onyebuchi Okeke
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
JUAN ANTONIO IBARRA MARTINEZ and
RAUL AMADOR