

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

William C. Sung, SB# 280792

E-Mail: william@justiceforworkers.com

Tiffany L. Luu, SB# 335127

E-Mail: tluu@justiceforworkers.com

3600 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1815

Los Angeles, CA 90010

Tel: 323-922-2000

Fax: 323-922-2000

Attorneys for Plaintiff RANDALL BACHMAN

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**

RANDALL BACHMAN, an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

GEODIS LOGISTICS LLC, a Tennessee
limited liability company; and DOES 1 through
50,

Defendants.

Case No.: CVRI2400956

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

- (1) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);**
- (2) **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194,
1198);**
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);**
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);**
- (5) **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE § 226);**
- (6) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);**
- (7) **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE
NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES
(LABOR CODE § 2802);**
- (8) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and**
- (9) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
CALIFORNIA PRIVATE**

**ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff RANDALL BACHMAN (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this Class and Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants GEODIS LOGISTICS LLC, a Tennessee limited liability company, and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 212, 218.5, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 245, 246, 256, 510, 512, 516, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2100, 2800, 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, 6720, Cal. Code Regs, tit. 8 section 3203, and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order 7-2001 (“Wage Order 7”), in addition to seeking injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and restitution. This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds \$25,000.

2. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including 7 County, and some of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in Riverside County. Furthermore, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within Riverside County.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant herein was, an individual over the age of eighteen (18) and is a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods applicable to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies, practices, and/or customs complained of herein and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 212, 218.5, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 245, 246,

1 256, 510, 512, 516, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2100, 2800,
2 2802, 2698, *et seq.*, 6720, Cal. Code Regs, tit. 8 section 3203, and Wage Order 7.

3 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the
4 applicable statute of limitations for each cause of action pled herein and continuing to the present,
5 Defendants engaged in, and continue to engage in, business, and employed Plaintiff and other,
6 similarly-situated non-exempt employees within Riverside County, and the State of California and,
7 therefore, were (and are) doing business in Riverside County and the State of California.

8 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
9 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said
10 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
11 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed and
12 believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
13 partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
14 and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined below) to be subject to the unlawful
15 employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

16 6. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of
17 the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore,
18 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each of the other
19 defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were acting
20 within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

21 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
22 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
23 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting within
24 the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To the extent
25 said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the remaining
26 Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting Defendants.

27 8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were members of, and
28 engaged in, a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and

1 scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise.

2 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
3 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
4 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged.

5 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

6 10. Defendants own and operate e-commerce distribution warehouses in the State of
7 California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee in inventory
8 control from approximately February 2023 to approximately July 2023 at its distribution warehouse
9 in Perris, California.

10 11. Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and Wage Order 1, § 4 entitle employees to receive no
11 less than the minimum wage fixed by the comission or by any applicable state or local law for all
12 hours worked. Labor Code §§ 510, 1198, and Wage Order 1, § 3 provide that non-exempt
13 employees are entitled to all overtime wages at the regular rate of pay. During the relevant time
14 period, Defendants' timekeeping and/or payroll policies and practices resulted in Plaintiff and other
15 aggrieved employees not being compensated for all hours actually worked. Plaintiff and other
16 aggrieved employees regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday or 40 hours in a
17 workweek. Upon information and belief, Defendants required Plaintiff and other aggrieved
18 employees to perform work before their scheduled shifts, after their scheduled shifts, and/or during
19 off-the-clock meal breaks, including waiting to clock in and out of their shifts and meal periods, and
20 failed to compensate employees for this time. Upon information and belief, Defendants also failed
21 to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration into the regular rate
22 of pay, including purported extra paid sick leave and bonuses. As a result, Plaintiff and other
23 aggrieved employees were not compensated for all earned minimum and overtime wages.

24 12. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and Wage Order 1, § 11 require employers to provide
25 non-exempt employees with compliant meal periods or pay premiums at the regular rate of
26 compensation, including by failing to incorporate purported extra paid sick leave and bonuses.
27 During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved
28 employees with all legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants' meal period

1 policies/practices, which have frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work),
2 short (less than 30 minutes), and/or missed meal periods. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and
3 other aggrieved employees were not able to take their legally compliant meal breaks due to work
4 demands imposed by Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants do not keep accurate
5 records of Plaintiff's and other aggrieved employees' hours worked, including accurate time records
6 showing when employees take their meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other
7 aggrieved employees were not provided with all legally compliant meal periods to which they were
8 entitled, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with the
9 required meal period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated
10 by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the
11 payment of meal period premium payments as required by Labor Code § 226.7 in the event that a
12 legally compliant meal period was not provided to their employees.

13 13. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and Wage Order 1, § 12 require employers to authorize and
14 permit non-exempt employees to take compliant rest periods or pay premiums at the regular rate of
15 compensation, including by failing to incorporate purported extra paid sick leave and bonuses.
16 During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not authorized and
17 permitted to take all required rest periods due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies/practices,
18 which failed to authorize and permit a net 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked, or
19 major fraction thereof. Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not able to take their legally
20 compliant rest breaks due to work demands imposed by Defendants. Additionally, although Plaintiff
21 and other aggrieved employees occasionally worked shifts in excess of 10 hours, Plaintiff and other
22 aggrieved employees were not authorized and permitted a third rest period during shifts in excess of
23 10 hours. On those occasions when Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not authorized
24 and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods to which they were entitled, Defendants
25 failed to compensate them with the required rest period premium(s) for each workday there was a
26 rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants
27 maintained no mechanism for the payment of rest period premium payments as required by Labor
28 Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally compliant rest period was not authorized and permitted to

1 their non-exempt employees.

2 14. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants violated Labor Code § 246 by
3 failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration into the paid
4 sick leave pay rate.

5 15. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, failure to
6 pay all meal and rest period premium wages, and unlawful timekeeping and payroll practices as
7 alleged above, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage
8 statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees. As a further result of Defendants' failure to
9 pay all minimum and overtime wages, sick leave wages, and meal and rest period premium wages,
10 Defendants failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees upon
11 their separation of employment from Defendants.

12 16. Section 15 of the applicable Wage Orders provide: "(A) The temperature maintained
13 in each work area shall provide reasonable comfort consistent with industry-wide standards for the
14 nature of the process and the work performed. (B) If excessive heat or humidity is created by the
15 work process, the employer shall take all feasible means to reduce such excessive heat or humidity
16 to a degree providing reasonable comfort. Where the nature of the employment requires a
17 temperature of less than 60° F, a heated room shall be provided to which employees may retire for
18 warmth, and such room shall be maintained at not less than 68° F. (C) A temperature of not less
19 than 68° F shall be maintained in the toilet rooms, resting rooms, and change rooms during hours of
20 use. (D) Federal and State energy guidelines shall prevail over any conflicting provision of this
21 section." California law requires an employer to endeavor to provide a safe and healthy workplace.
22 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, §3203.) Labor Code section 6720 required the California Division of
23 Occupational Safety and Health ("Cal/OSHA") to propose an indoor heat illness standard by
24 January 1,2019. (Lab. Code, § 6720.) Cal/OSHA's draft standard applies its proposed regulations to
25 "all indoor work areas where the temperature equals or exceeds 82 degrees Fahrenheit when
26 employees are present." During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and
27 other aggrieved employees with reasonable comfort by maintaining the indoor temperature within
28 the range of industry standards by, inter alia, providing adequate heating, air conditioning, and/or

1 ventilation and failed to maintain a temperature of not less than 68° F in toilet rooms and/or
2 breakrooms for Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees.

3 17. Section 14 of Wage Order 7 provide: “(A) All working employees shall be provided
4 with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats. (B) When
5 employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work
6 requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to
7 the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the
8 performance of their duties.” Defendants violated these requirements by failing to provide sufficient
9 seating to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees while on breaks, which forced Plaintiff and
10 other non-exempt employees to sit in their cars or outside the facility on curbs during their meal and
11 rest breaks.

12 18. Labor Code §§ 2100, *et seq.* regulate the use of quotas by warehouse distribution
13 centers, including Defendants. Defendants directly or indirectly control 100 or more employees at a
14 single warehouse distribution center or 1,000 or more employees at one or more warehouse
15 distribution centers in California. During the relevant time period, Defendants employed a quota
16 within meaning of Labor Code § 2100. On information and belief, Defendants violated Labor Code
17 §§ 2100, *et seq.* by failing to provide aggrieved employees with notice of the quotas and/or because
18 the quotas prevented aggrieved employees from taking meal periods, rest periods, and/or the use of
19 bathroom facilities.

20 19. Labor Code § 212(a) permits wages to be paid by a check that “is negotiable and
21 payable in cash, on demand, without discount, at some established place of business in the state, the
22 name and address of which must appear on the instrument, and at the time of its issuance and for a
23 reasonable time thereafter, which must be at least 30 days, the maker or drawer has sufficient funds
24 in, or credit, arrangement, or understanding with the drawee for its payment.” During the relevant
25 time period, Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 212 by forcing Plaintiff and other non-exempt
26 employees to receive their wages via direct deposit or pay cards.

27 20. On or about February 22, 2024, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and
28 notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of

1 Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and Plaintiff's intent to bring a claim for civil penalties
2 under Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the Labor Code identified in the
3 preceding paragraph. Now that 33 days and 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying
4 Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, Defendants have not cured any curable violations,
5 and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has
6 exhausted administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act
7 with respect to these violations.

8 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

9 21. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following
10 Classes pursuant to § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure:

- 11 a. Minimum Wage Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants
12 in the State of California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll
13 policies and/or practices, between January 1, 2022 and October 10, 2024.
- 14 b. Overtime Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the
15 State of California who worked more than eight hours per day and/or 40 hours per
16 week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices,
17 between January 1, 2022 and October 10, 2024.
- 18 c. Meal Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
19 the State of California who: (i) worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0 hours;
20 and/or (ii) worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours, between January 1, 2022
21 and October 10, 2024.
- 22 d. Rest Period Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
23 the State of California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 or more hours, between
24 January 1, 2022 and October 10, 2024.
- 25 e. Wage Statement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants
26 in the State of California who received a wage statement, between February 22, 2023
27 and October 10, 2024.

28 ///

1 f. Waiting Time Penalty Class: All of Defendants' formerly employed members of the
2 Minimum Wage Class, Overtime Class, Rest Period Class, and/or Meal Period Class
3 January 1, 2022 and October 10, 2024.

4 g. Expense Reimbursement Class: All current and former non-exempt employees of
5 Defendants in the State of California who were not reimbursed for all necessary
6 business expenses, January 1, 2022 and October 10, 2024.

7 h. Unfair Competition: All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in
8 the State of California employed between January 2, 2022 and October 20, 2024.

9 22. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that
10 joinder of all members would be impractical, if not impossible. The membership of the Classes is
11 unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number
12 greater than 50 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection
13 of Defendants' employment records, including payroll records.

14 23. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well-Defined Community of**
15 **Interest**: There are predominant common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and members of
16 the Classes, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including,
17 without limitation to:

- 18 a. Whether Defendants properly paid all overtime wages to members of the Overtime
19 Class;
- 20 b. Whether Defendants paid at least the minimum wage for all hours worked to
21 members of the Minimum Wage Class;
- 22 c. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods or paid meal period
23 premium wages due to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§
24 226.7 and 512;
- 25 d. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted all legally compliant rest periods or
26 paid all rest period premium wages due to members of the Rest Period Class
27 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;

28 ///

- e. Whether Defendants reimbursed members of the Expense Reimbursement Class for all necessary business expenses pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;
- f. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226; and
- g. Whether Defendants timely paid all final wages to members of the Waiting Time Class at the time of their separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

These common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class member's showing as to their eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of their damages.

24. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s) of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not paid all minimum and overtime wages owed due to Defendants' timekeeping and payroll policies/practices, not provided all required meal periods, not authorized and permitted all rest periods, did not receive premium pay for non-compliant meal and rest periods, not paid all final wages upon separation of employment, and not provided with accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements.

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

26. **Superiority:** The Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who

1 have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic
2 and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this
3 action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class
4 action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged
5 herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily
6 gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited
7 resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

8 27. Moreover, requiring each member of the Class(es) to pursue an individual remedy
9 would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file
10 an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and
11 permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. The claims of the individual
12 members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution
13 considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending hereto.

14 28. Furthermore, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members,
15 even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
16 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish
17 potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with
18 respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest
19 of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or
20 impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. As such, the Classes identified
21 hereinabove are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

24 **(Against All Defendants)**

25 29. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
26 fully set forth herein.

27 30. Labor Code §§ 204, 1182.12, 1197, and Wage Order 7, § 4 establish the right of
28 employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state or local law.

1 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal
2 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with
3 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
4 wages and interest accrued thereon. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform its
5 pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the
6 Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked, including, but not limited to, all hours they were
7 subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and
8 Wage Order 7.

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

14 32. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of minimum wages, Plaintiff and
15 members of the Minimum Wage Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid wages, including
16 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
17 218.6, 558, 1194, 1194.2, and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§ 3287 and
18 3289.

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
20 **OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS**
21 **(Against All Defendants)**

22 33. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
23 fully set forth herein.

24 34. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198, and
25 Wage Order 7, § 3, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages
26 and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure
27 to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

28 ///

1 35. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-
2 exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours
3 worked pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 7. Wage Order 7, § 3 requires an employer
4 to pay an employee one and one-half (1½) times and two times the employee's regular rate of pay
5 for overtime and double time hours work. Defendants caused Plaintiff and members of the Overtime
6 Class to work overtime hours but failed to compensate these employees for all overtime hours
7 actually worked.

8 36. As a consequence of Defendants' non-payment of overtime wages, Plaintiff and
9 members of the Overtime Class seek recovery of the balance of unpaid overtime wages, including
10 interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§
11 204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 1194, and 1198; Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and Civil Code §§
12 3287 and 3289.

13 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

15 **(Against All Defendants)**

16 37. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
17 fully set forth herein.

18 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
19 in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including
20 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods in
21 accordance with the mandates of the Labor Code and Wage Order 7, § 11.

22 39. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to
23 Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of compensation, in
24 accordance with California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

25 40. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful meal period practices, Plaintiff and
26 members of the Meal Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for meal period
27 violations including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code
28 §§ 226.7, 512, 558, Wage Order 7, and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289.

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 41. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
5 fully set forth herein.

6 42. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and Wage Order 7, § 12 and establish the right of
7 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least 10 minutes for each four-hour period
8 worked, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that
9 despite Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class
10 to take all legally compliant rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants did not pay these individuals
11 an additional hour of pay at their respective regular rate for the rest periods that they failed to
12 authorize and permit them to take, as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

13 43. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful rest period practices, Plaintiff and
14 members of the Rest Period Class seek recovery of unpaid premium wages for rest period violations
15 including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees,
16 and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, Wage Order 7, and Civil Code §§
17 3287 and 3289.

18 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **WAGE STATEMENT PENALTIES**

20 **(Against All Defendants)**

21 44. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
22 fully set forth herein.

23 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
24 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff
25 and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
26 that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of pay
27 and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the pay
28 period, and/or the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of

1 Labor Code § 226.

2 46. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class
3 with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led
4 to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages and meal and rest period
5 premium wages owed and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies
6 in Defendants' reported payroll data.

7 47. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful wage statement practices, Plaintiff and
8 members of the Wage Statement Class seek damages and/or statutory penalties, reasonable
9 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226.

10 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**
12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 48. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
14 fully set forth herein.

15 49. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an
16 employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of separation of employment in the event the
17 employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of their
18 intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit,
19 said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last
20 date of employment.

21 50. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed
22 to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages due to them at their
23 separation from employment, including unpaid minimum and overtime wages as well as unpaid
24 meal and rest period premium wages.

25 51. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a
26 matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and members of
27 the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to
28 the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-202.

52. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay Plaintiff and the members of the Waiting Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in continued payment of daily wages up to thirty days from the time the wages were due.

53. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class seek statutory penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 203.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES

(Against All Defendants)

54. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

55. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2802, which states that “an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or obedience to the directions of the employer.”

56. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and members of the Expense Reimbursement Class all necessary business expenses they incurred in the performance of their job duties.

57. As a consequence of Defendants' unlawful practices, Plaintiff and members of the class seek recovery of unreimbursed business expenses, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(Against All Defendants)

58. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

/ / /

1 59. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business
2 practices in California in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by:

- 3 a. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum
4 wages due;
- 5 b. failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages due;
- 6 c. failing to provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal
7 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all meal period premium
8 wages due;
- 9 d. failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class all rest
10 periods to which they are entitled, and failing to pay them all rest period premium
11 wages due;
- 12 e. failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses to Plaintiff and members of the
13 Expense Reimbursement Class;
- 14 f. failing to issue accurate and itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and members of
15 the Wage Statement Class;
- 16 g. failing to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time
17 Penalty Class;
- 18 h. Violating Labor Code § 212;
- 19 i. Violating Labor Code § 2100, *et seq.* with respect to quotas to Plaintiff and the
20 Class;
- 21 j. Failure to provide suitable seating to Plaintiff and the Class in violation of Labor
22 Code § 1198 and Wage Order 7;
- 23 k. Failure to provide reas to Plaintiff and the Class in violation of Labor Code § 1198
24 and Wage Order 7; and
- 25 l. Violating workplace temperature requirements.

26 60. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived
27 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally
28 entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage over

1 Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to
2 do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

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

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

9 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 63. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though
13 fully set forth herein.

14 64. Plaintiff, an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et*
15 *seq.*, acting on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees (collectively, "Aggrieved
16 Employees"), brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due
17 to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant
18 to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial
19 violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or
20 intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each
21 employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and
22 \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3)
23 \$100 for each initial violation and \$250 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code §
24 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250 for each initial violation and \$1,000 for each
25 subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to
26 Labor Code § 256, a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as
27 waiting time under the terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100 for each initial violation and
28 \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor

Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code violations:

- a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code § 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- b. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned overtime compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;
- d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay rest period premium wages, to Aggrieved Employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;
- e. Failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Aggrieved Employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202;
- g. Failure to reimburse Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802;
- h. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all paid sick leave wages in violation of Labor Code § 246;
- i. Failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204;
- j. Violating Labor Code § 212;
- k. Violating Labor Code §§ 2100, *et seq.* re: quotas in distribution centers;
- l. Failing to comply Wage Order regulations on suitable seating and temperature in indoor workplaces in violation of Labor Code § 1198; and
- m. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

65. Plaintiff has incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiff is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;
5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of overtime wages and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for meal period premium wages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for rest period premium wages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226;
9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203;
10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for unreimbursed business expenses according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;
11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

/ / /

1 12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other Aggrieved
2 Employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and
3 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to
4 pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation
5 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210 and/or 225.5 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the
6 amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent
7 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial
8 violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee
9 per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation
10 pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (5) pursuant to Labor Code § 256, a
11 civil penalty in an amount not exceeding 30 days per former employee as waiting time under the
12 terms of Labor Code § 203; and/or (6) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each
13 subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which
14 no civil penalty is specifically provided;

15 13. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6
16 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

17 14. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§
18 218.5, 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

19 15. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

20 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

21 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims.

22
23 DATED: January 15, 2025

JUSTICE FOR WORKERS, P.C.

24
25 By: 

26 William C. Sung

Tiffany L. Luu

27 Attorneys for Plaintiff RANDALL BACHMAN
28