

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Misty M. Lauby, Esq. [CSB No. 243009]
misty@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513
Riverside, CA 92504
Tel: (951) 320-1444
Fax: (951) 320-1445

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

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

JONATHAN NAVA, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

TEMECULA VALLEY DRYWALL, INC. a
California Corporation; LORRY HALES, an
individual; DOUGLAS MISEMER, an
individual; and DOES 1 through 20,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: CVRI2400423
*[Assigned to Hon. Harold Hopp, Dept 1, for
all purposes]*

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (6) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (7) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
- (8) Unfair and Unlawful Competition;

PAGA CLAIMS

- (9) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (10) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (11) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (12) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (13) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (14) Failure to Timely Pay Wages Each Period;
- (15) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (16) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
- (17) Failure to Maintain Employment Records.

Plaintiff Jonathan Nava (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Plaintiff brings this action against his former employer(s), Defendants TEMECULA VALLEY DRYWALL, INC., LORRY HALES, and DOUGLAS MISEMER, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively, “Defendants”) on behalf of all current and former nonexempt employees employed by Defendants in California (the “Class” or “Represented Employees”), for Labor Code violations stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay all wages owed, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest breaks, failure to timely pay wages each period, failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to maintain employment records.

2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately September 2020 through approximately August 2023.

3. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Represented Employees were subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations to which Plaintiff was subjected during employment.

4. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular, and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked. For example, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided proper minimum and overtime wages due to the Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked. Among other violations, the Defendants did not have a system in place for employees to track their time and paid a flat 40 hours per week regardless of how many hours Plaintiff and Represented Employees worked. Moreover, 30-minute meal periods were deducted regardless of whether they were taken or cut short. Additionally, Plaintiff and Represented Employees were expected to clean and maintain tools at home after they return from work for the evening without compensation.

1 5. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were also denied 30-minute off-duty
2 meal periods, as mandated by California law. As a result of Defendants' policies and practices,
3 the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1)
4 instructed not to take a lunch due to company policy despite never agreeing to waive the lunch
5 period, (2) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (3) forced to take an on-duty meal
6 period while under the control of the Company, (4) forced to take a meal period after the 5th
7 hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated second or third meal periods on shifts in excess of
8 10 hours or 15 hours, respectively. Even on occasions when they were denied a meal period,
9 Defendants nevertheless automatically deducted 30 minutes of pay.

10 6. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Represented Employees with
11 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
12 mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the Represented
13 Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to
14 company policies and/or being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally, Plaintiff
15 and the Represented Employees were not permitted to leave the premises for rest breaks, in
16 violation of California law. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented
17 Employees worked longer shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit mandated third or
18 fourth rest breaks.

19 7. Moreover, at all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Represented
20 Employees to incur necessary business-related expenses and costs without reimbursement,
21 including, but not limited to, expenses related to: (1) acquiring and maintaining cellular phones
22 and related data plans to perform tasks for Defendants and (2) acquiring and providing their own
23 tools to perform tasks for Defendants.

24 8. Plaintiff also alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
25 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
26 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
27 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
28 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to

1 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, wage premiums, among others.

2 9. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
3 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

4 10. Defendant also failed to maintain employment records in violation of Labor Code
5 § 1174(d), and § 7 of the IWC Wage Orders.

6 11. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' violations of the wage and hour components of
7 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their
8 level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over
9 its competitors.

10 12. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
11 Represented Employees' employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees'
12 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
13 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
14 hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
15 underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

16 13. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, injunctive, equitable, and
17 monetary relief against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of himself and the Represented
18 Employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys' fees,
19 penalties, costs and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208,
20 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
21 1199, and 2802 among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the
22 right to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

23 **II. JURISDICTION**

24 14. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the
25 Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

26 **III. VENUE**

27 15. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil
28 Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in Riverside County and the unlawful acts

1 alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in Riverside
2 County. Furthermore, Defendants employed or employ Plaintiff and Represented Employees in
3 Riverside County.

4 **IV. PARTIES**

5 **Plaintiff**

6 16. Plaintiff and Class Representative Jonathan Nava was employed by Defendants
7 from approximately September 2020 through August 2023 and performed work for Defendants
8 in Riverside County.

9 **Defendants**

10 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Temecula
11 Valley Drywall, Inc. is a California Corporation authorized to and doing business in Riverside
12 County, California. Plaintiff is also informed and believes that Defendant Temecula Valley
13 Drywall, Inc. is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
14 during the applicable statutory periods.

15 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Lorry Hales
16 is an individual authorized to and doing business in Riverside County, California. Plaintiff is
17 also informed and believes that Defendant Lorry Hales is and/or was the legal employer of
18 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

19 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Douglas
20 Misemer is an individual authorized to and doing business in Riverside County, California.
21 Plaintiff is also informed and believes that Defendant Douglas Misemer is and/or was the legal
22 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

23 20. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of
24 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20,
25 inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for
26 the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Represented Employees by virtue of
27 Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious
28 names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE

Defendants when ascertained.

21. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he and the Represented Employees worked under the joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and each of them, acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a unity of interest and ownership between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as a single employer of Plaintiff and other Represented Employees.

22. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally, Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor operations, and common ownership or financial control.

23. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of their remaining co-Defendants.

24. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly, the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed

1 jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the
2 separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege,
3 thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

4 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

5 25. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 26. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as
8 a class action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

9 27. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning
10 four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

11 28. The Class, also referred to as the “Represented Employees,” that Plaintiff seeks to
12 represent is defined as follows:

13 All current and former nonexempt employees employed by
14 Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.

15 29. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

16 **Meal Break Subclass**

17 All Represented Employees who worked a shift in excess of
18 5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

19 **Rest Break Subclass**

20 All Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least
21 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

22 **Unreimbursed Expense Subclass**

23 All Represented Employees who were required to incur
24 expenses to discharge their duties for Defendants without
25 reimbursement during the Relevant Time Period.

26 **Waiting Time Penalties Subclass**

27 All Represented Employees who separated from their
28 employment with Defendants during the period three years

1 before the filing of this action and ending when final
2 judgment is entered.

3 **Wage Statement Penalties Subclass**

4 All Represented Employees during the period one year
5 before the filing of this action and ending when final
6 judgment is entered.

7 30. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class description with greater
8 specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues as appropriate.

9 31. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that he
10 seeks to represent.

11 32. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
12 under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the
13 litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

14 33. **Numerosity:** The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that
15 a joinder of all Represented Employees is impracticable. Although the exact number is currently
16 unknown to Plaintiff, this information is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

17 34. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which
18 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including
19 without limitation:

20 i. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
21 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all
22 hours worked;

23 ii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
24 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
25 Employees for hours above 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week;

26 iii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
27 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Meal Break
28 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass

1 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a compliant
2 meal period was not provided;

3 iv. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
4 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Rest Break
5 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass
6 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a paid rest
7 break was not provided;

8 v. Whether Defendants violated the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage
9 Order by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for business
10 expenses incurred discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of their employer;

11 vi. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
12 timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment between Defendants and Plaintiff and
13 the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass, whether such separation was voluntary or involuntary;

14 vii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
15 provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized
16 wage statements;

17 viii. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§
18 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest
19 breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure
20 to timely pay final wages; failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to
21 maintain employment records;

22 ix. Whether Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to equitable
23 relief pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

24 35. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims, as the Class Representative, are typical of the
25 claims of The Class. Plaintiff, like other members of The Class, was subjected to Defendants'
26 ongoing Labor Code and Wage Order violations including pertaining to the failure to pay all
27 wages owed, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to provide mandated paid rest
28 breaks, failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and failure to provide

1 accurate itemized wage statements.

2 36. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff, as the Class Representative, will fairly
3 and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's interests are not in
4 conflict with those of the Class. Class Representative's counsel are competent and experienced in
5 litigating large employment class actions and other complex litigation matters, including cases
6 like this case.

7 37. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class
8 action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this
9 controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of
10 law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual
11 members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to
12 recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action
13 treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is
14 most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

17 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

18 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

19 38. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
20 as if fully alleged herein.

21 39. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement
22 to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for
23 each hour worked.

24 40. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided proper minimum and
25 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
26 worked. As a result of these policies and practices, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
27 were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known
28 they were performing.

1 41. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper minimum wages to Plaintiff and the
2 Represented Employees due to its practice of routinely failing to pay for time spent performing
3 work for the company and automatically deducting for meal periods even when such meal
4 periods were not taken. Moreover, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were expected to
5 clean their tools at home after they were off-the clock.

6 42. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
7 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 16 § 4, and
8 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

9 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
10 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
11 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

12 44. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
13 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each
14 hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay
15 them in accordance thereto.

16 45. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
17 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
18 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
19 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
20 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

21 46. During employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
22 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

23 47. As a result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
24 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

25 48. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
26 all unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs of
27 suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1194.2, against Defendants in an amount to be proven
28 at trial.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

23
24
25
26
27
28

26
27
28

1 56. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
2 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
3 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
4 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
5 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

6 57. During the employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
7 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

8 58. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
9 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

10 59. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
11 all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against
12 Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

13 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

15 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

16 *Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

17 60. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
18 as if fully alleged herein.

19 61. Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
20 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
21 periods.

22 62. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
23 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

24 63. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
25 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
26 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
27 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
28 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers

1 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
2 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

3 64. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
4 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
5 pay for each meal period that is missed.

6 65. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were denied
7 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
8 practices, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations
9 when they were: (1) instructed not to take a lunch due to company policy despite never agreeing
10 to waive the lunch period, (2) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (3) forced to take an
11 on-duty meal period while under the control of the Company, (4) forced to take a meal period
12 after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated second or third meal periods on shifts
13 in excess of 10 hours or 15 hours, respectively.

14 66. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
15 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not provided with all
16 mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass one
17 additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

18 67. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Meal
19 Break Subclass all mandated meal periods and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
20 meal or rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

21 68. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass did not
22 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
23 obtained from Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not willfully obtained, were not
24 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
25 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
26 to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

27 69. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
28 periods as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of

1 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
2 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
3 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not
4 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

5 70. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
6 and IWC Wage Order § 11, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Meal
7 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

8 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

10 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

11 *Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

12 71. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
13 as if fully alleged herein.

14 72. Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
15 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

16 73. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
17 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

18 74. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
19 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
20 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
21 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
22 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

23 75. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
24 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
25 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

26 76. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
27 Break Subclass with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
28 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the

1 Rest Break Subclass were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due
2 to Defendants' policies and being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally, Plaintiff
3 and the Rest Break Subclass were often not permitted to leave the premises for rest breaks, in
4 violation of California law. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Rest Break
5 Subclass worked lengthy shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit mandated third or
6 fourth rest breaks.

7 77. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
8 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were not provided with all
9 mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
10 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

11 78. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
12 Break Subclass all mandated rest breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
13 rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

14 79. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with rest breaks
15 as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of each rest
16 break not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage
17 Order § 12. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at the
18 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a paid rest break was not
19 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

20 80. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
21 and IWC Wage Order § 12, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Rest
22 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

23 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

25 (Labor Code § 2802)

26 *Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass Against All Defendants*

27 81. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
28 as if fully alleged herein.

82. Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing reimbursement of business expenses.

83. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of their employer.

84. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass to incur necessary business-related expenses and costs without reimbursement, including, but not limited to, acquiring and/or providing tools that were required to carry out their tasks for Defendants.

85. At all relevant times herein, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for expenses incurred as a direct consequence of employment with Defendants and/or under the direction of Defendants.

86. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to reimburse the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass, including Plaintiff, for expenses incurred while discharging duties to Defendants, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

87. As a direct result of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 2802 and IWC Wage Order § 9(B), Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass have suffered, and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to such incurred expenses, expenses, and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their obligations under the law, all in an amount to be proved at time of trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass against All Defendants

88. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

1 89. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
2 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing
3 and payment of wages.

4 90. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
5 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

6 91. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
7 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
8 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

9 92. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
10 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
11 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

12 93. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby
13 Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass were not paid all wages due and owing upon
14 separation of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

15 94. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all
16 wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass upon separation of
17 employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as
18 meal and rest period premiums.

19 95. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
20 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass all
21 wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and
22 202. Consequently, pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendants owe Plaintiff and the Waiting
23 Time Penalties Subclass the above-described waiting time penalty, all in an amount to be shown
24 according to proof at trial and within the jurisdiction of this Court.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 (Labor Code § 226)

4 *Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass against All Defendants*

5 96. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
6 alleged herein.

7 97. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
8 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
9 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

10 98. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
11 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
12 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
13 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
14 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
15 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

16 99. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
17 and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a wage
18 statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
19 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

20 100. For example, Defendants did not accurately record the hours worked by the
21 Represented Employees. Therefore, Defendants' wage statements failed to accurately state total
22 hours worked in the pay period. Also, the wage statements failed to state all applicable rates of
23 pay and corresponding hours worked at each rate.

24 101. Also, due to violations discussed herein, Defendants' wage statements failed to
25 accurately state gross wages earned, all deductions, and net wages earned.

26 102. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
27 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a
28 wage statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the

1 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

2 103. Defendants' failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the
3 Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the
4 calculation and rate of pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore,
5 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting
6 miscalculation of wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said
7 Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered
8 and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost
9 interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully
10 perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to
11 proof at trial.

12 104. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
13 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered an injury in
14 that each was prevented from knowing, understanding and disputing the wage payments paid to
15 them. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have each suffered an
16 injury in that the failure to show all wages earned on the itemized wage statements resulted in
17 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees being denied all necessary deductions, payments, and
18 withholdings owed by the employer, including, but not limited to, the failure to make all
19 necessary contributions for unemployment benefits, social security benefits, proper payment of
20 taxes and withholdings, and other mandated state and federal benefits.

21 105. Plaintiff has also been injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt
22 to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the
23 mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

24 106. Labor Code § 226(e) requires Defendants to pay the greater of all actual damages
25 or fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and
26 one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods, plus
27 attorney's fees and costs, to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass who were
28 injured by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a). The exact amount of the

1 applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

2 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION**

4 (Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*)

5 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees against All Defendants*

6 107. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
7 as if fully alleged herein.

8 108. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair
9 competition, which includes any “unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.” The
10 Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact,
11 due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

12 109. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under Business &
13 Professions Code § 17021.

14 110. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California’s wage
15 and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide
16 mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to timely pay wages upon separation of
17 employment, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements all to decrease their costs
18 and increase their profits.

19 111. At all times relevant herein, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Represented
20 Employees wages and monies and other financial obligations to which they were entitled.

21 112. As a result of Defendants’ failure to comply with the Labor Code and IWC
22 Orders, Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, suffered a loss of wages and monies, all in
23 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. Defendants’ ongoing violations of the
24 foregoing statutes and laws constitute a violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*

25 113. Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders and
26 its scheme to lower its payroll costs as alleged herein, constitute unlawful and unfair business
27 practices because it was done in a systematic manner over a period of time to the detriment of the
28 Plaintiff and all others similarly-situated.

1 114. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
2 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
3 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
4 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

5 115. A violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq. may be
6 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
7 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, are
8 unlawful and in violation of public policy, and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive,
9 fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
10 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

11 116. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has no plain,
12 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which they have suffered as a
13 consequence of Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of
14 the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
15 and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
16 harm unless Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
17 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

18 117. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is entitled to,
19 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge the profits which Defendants have
20 acquired, or of which Plaintiff and Represented Employees have been deprived, by means of the
21 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the
22 Represented Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the unfair
23 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

24 118. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
25 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
26 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining Defendants, and each of them, from
27 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in
28 the future.

1 119. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and
2 Represented Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
3 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
4 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and
5 Represented Employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil
6 Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

7 **VI. LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CAUSES OF ACTION**
8 **(Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)**

9 120. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as he was employed by
10 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
11 violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil
12 action filed on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former non-exempt
13 employees employed by Defendants in California against whom one or more of the alleged
14 violations was committed (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

15 121. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing
16 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to
17 Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including
18 the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

19 122. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed since the notice date, Plaintiff has
20 fully satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit under the PAGA. Plaintiff seeks to recover
21 all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, as well as
22 attorneys' fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by PAGA through a representative
23 action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Superior Court*
24 (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Plaintiff is not required to, nor does he, seek class certification of the
25 PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 123. Plaintiff incorporates preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if
6 fully alleged herein.

7 124. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to
8 be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each
9 hour worked.

10 125. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and
11 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
12 worked. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were
13 required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they
14 were performing.

15 126. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper minimum wages to Plaintiff and the
16 Aggrieved Employees due to its practice of requiring employees of routinely failing to pay for
17 time spent performing work for the company and automatically deducting for meal periods even
18 when such meal periods were not taken. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor
19 Code laws and minimum wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC
20 Wage Order 9, § 4, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

21 127. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
22 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
23 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

24 128. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
25 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
26 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

27 ///

28 ///

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

129. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

130. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

131. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12) in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

132. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

133. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper overtime to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees due to the failure to pay premiums on work in excess 8 and/or 12 and/or 40 per week.

134. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week without proper overtime compensation.

135. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

1 136. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
2 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
3 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

4 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS**

6 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

7 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

8 137. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
9 as if fully alleged herein.

10 138. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
11 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
12 periods.

13 139. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
14 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

15 140. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
16 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
17 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
18 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
19 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
20 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
21 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

22 141. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
23 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
24 pay for each meal period that is missed.

25 142. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were denied
26 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
27 practices, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were subjected to meal period violations when
28 they were: (1) instructed not to take a lunch due to company policy despite never agreeing to

1 waive the lunch period, (2) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (3) forced to take an
2 on-duty meal period while under the control of the Company, (4) forced to take a meal period
3 after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated second or third meal periods on shifts
4 in excess of 10 hours or 15 hours, respectively. Defendants also automatically deducted 30
5 minutes of wages for a meal period even in instances in which a meal period was not provided.

6 143. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
7 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
8 all mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
9 one additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

10 144. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
11 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
12 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
13 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
14 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

16 145. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
17 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
18 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

19 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

21 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

22 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

23 146. Plaintiff incorporates preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if
24 fully alleged herein.

25 147. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
26 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

27 148. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
28 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

1 149. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
2 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
3 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
4 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
5 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

6 150. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
7 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
8 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

9 151. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the
10 Aggrieved Employees with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
11 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the
12 Aggrieved Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks
13 due to Defendants' policies and being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally,
14 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were often not permitted to leave the premises for rest
15 breaks, in violation of California law. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the
16 Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 10 hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize
17 and/or permit a third mandated rest break.

18 152. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
19 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
20 all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
21 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

22 153. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
23 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
24 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

3 (Labor Code § 2802)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 154. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as
6 if fully alleged herein.

7 155. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
8 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing reimbursement of
9 business expenses.

10 156. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
11 expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of
12 their employer.

13 157. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants
14 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to (1) acquire and maintain cellular phones and
15 related data plans to perform tasks for Defendants and (2) acquiring and providing their own
16 tools to perform tasks for Defendants.

17 158. At all relevant times herein, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they
18 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for expenses incurred as a direct
19 consequence of employment with Defendants and/or under the direction of Defendants.

20 159. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
21 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
22 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

23 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

25 (Labor Code § 204)

26 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

27 160. Plaintiff incorporates preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if
28 fully alleged herein.

1 161. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “nonexempt” employees
2 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the
3 timing of payment of wages each period.

4 162. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
5 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
6 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
7 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
8 the following month.

9 163. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states “[t]he requirements of this section shall
10 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
11 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.”

12 164. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the
13 Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each period within the time required by
14 Labor Code § 204. Moreover, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited to,
16 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums, within the
17 time specified by Labor Code § 204.

18 165. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
19 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
20 and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

21 **FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

23 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 and 256)

24 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

25 166. Plaintiff incorporates preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if
26 fully alleged herein.

27 167. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “non-exempt” employees
28 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the

1 timing and payment of final wages.

2 168. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
3 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

4 169. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
5 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
6 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

7 170. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
8 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
9 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

10 171. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
11 Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not
12 limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums,
13 within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

14 172. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
15 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
16 due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

17 173. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
18 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
19 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

20 **SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

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

23 (Labor Code § 226)

24 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

25 174. Plaintiff incorporates preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if
26 fully alleged herein.

27 175. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
28 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of

1 accurate itemized wage statements.

2 176. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
3 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
4 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
5 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
6 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
7 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

8 177. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
9 and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants failed to provide a wage statement to Plaintiff
10 and the Aggrieved Employees that complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

11 178. For example, Defendants did not accurately record the hours worked by the
12 Aggrieved Employees. Therefore, Defendants' wage statements failed to accurately state total
13 hours worked in the pay period. Also, the wage statements failed to state all applicable rates of
14 pay and corresponding hours worked at each rate.

15 179. Also, due to violations discussed herein, Defendants' wage statements failed to
16 accurately state gross wages earned, all deductions, and net wages earned.

17 180. Additionally, Defendants' wage statements frequently failed to state the accurate
18 overtime rate of pay.

19 181. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
20 to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants failed to provide a wage statement
21 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the requirements of
22 Labor Code § 226(a).

23 182. As a result of the Defendants' violations of Labor Code §226(a)(9), Plaintiff seeks
24 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
25 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.
26 See *Raines v. Coastal Pacific Food Distributors, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 667, 675 ("Section
27 226.3 provides the civil penalty for failure to comply" with Labor Code § 226).

28 ///

1 **SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

3 **FAILURE TO MAINTAIN EMPLOYMENT RECORDS**

4 (Labor Code §§ 1174, 1174.5, and § 7 of the IWC Wage Orders)

5 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

6 183. Plaintiff incorporates preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if
7 fully alleged herein.

8 184. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
9 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws requiring the maintenance of
10 employment records.

11 185. Labor Code § 1174(d), and § 7 of the IWC Wage Orders require employers to
12 maintain accurate employment records, including accurate payroll records showing the total
13 number of regular and overtime hours worked each day by employees, including meal periods,
14 and the gross wages earned by the employee, including all applicable pay rates and the
15 corresponding number of hours worked at each pay rate, among other requirements.

16 186. Here, the Company failed to maintain accurate employment records as mandated
17 by California law. Therefore, in addition to recovering the amount of attorneys' fees and cost
18 incurred herein, Plaintiff seeks assessment of civil penalties in accordance with Labor Code §§
19 1174(d), 1174.5, 1199, and 2699.

20 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and all others
22 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
23 follows:

24 1. As to the Ninth through Seventeenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all
25 applicable and available remedies under the PAGA;

26 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under the PAGA;

27 3. That the First through Eighth Causes of Action be certified as a class action;

28 4. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;

1 5. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;

2 6. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Eighth
3 Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and
4 Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;

5 7. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by
6 law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;

7 8. For injunctive relief and/or restitution as provided by the Labor Code and
8 Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;

9 9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200,
10 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197,
11 1198, 1199, 2802 among other sections inadvertently omitted;

12 10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
13 not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties according to proof, including interest
14 thereon;

15 11. For pre- and post-judgment interest; and

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

17 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

18 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby
19 demands a jury trial as to the First through Eighth Causes of Action pled herein.

20
21 Dated: November 1, 2024

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

22
23 BY:


Brian J. Mankin, Esq.

Misty M. Lauby, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

PROOF OF SERVICE
(Pursuant to CCP §§ 1013(a)(1) and 2015.5)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

I am employed in the County of Riverside, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513, Riverside, CA 92504.

On November 19, 2024, I caused to be served the foregoing document(s) described as follows:

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

I declare that I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with the U.S. postal service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ **By Mail** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Riverside, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

☐ **By Facsimile** I sent this document via fax to all parties as listed on attached service list, on

☐ **By Overnight Service** I deposited such envelope in a facility regularly maintained by the United Parcel Service for receipt of items for overnight delivery, with overnight delivery expenses prepaid, addressed to the person to be served.

☒ **By Email or Electronic Transmission:** Pursuant to CCP § 1010.6 or an agreement of the parties to accept service by email or electronic transmission, I caused the document(s) to be sent from email address tracie@lmlfirm.com to the persons at the electronic notification address listed in the service list. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was not successful.

☐ **By Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested** I caused such envelope with postage fully prepaid thereon, to be placed in the United States mail at Riverside, California

☐ **By Personal Service** I caused said document(s) to be personally served by hand on the parties listed on the attached service list.

☒ **State** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on November 19, 2024, Riverside, California.

☐ **Federal** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.



Tracie Chiarito, Declarant

SERVICE LIST

HILL, FARRER & BURRILL LLP

James A. Bowles, Esq.

jbowles@hillfarrer.com

Richard S. Zuniga, Esq.

rzuniga@hillfarrer.com

Elissa L. Gysi, Esq.

egysi@hillfarrer.com

One California Plaza

300 S. Grand Avenue, 37th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90071-3147

Telephone: 213.620.0460 || Fax: 213.624.4840

Attorneys for Defendants

TEMECULA VALLEY DRYWALL, INC.,

LORRY HALES, and DOUGLAS MISEMER