

D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
David Keledjian (SBN 309135)
d.keledjian@d.law
Kevin Burns (SBN 352713)
k.burns@d.law
880 E. Broadway
Glendale, CA 91205
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff DUSTIN SMITH

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DUSTIN SMITH, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated, and the
general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED SEATING AND MOBILITY,
L.L.C., a Missouri corporation;
NUMOTION, a business entity of
unknown form; and DOES 1 through
50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 8:24-cv-00747-JVS-DFM

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198);
3. Failure to Pay Hourly Wages and Overtime (Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198);
4. Failure to Provide Accurate Written Wage Statements (Lab. Code §§ 226(a));
5. Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203);
6. Failure to Indemnify (Lab. Code § 2802);
7. Unfair Competition for Sick Pay Practices (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*);
8. Unfair Competition for Derivative Claims (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff DUSTIN SMITH (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself, all others similarly
2 situated, and the general public, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this class action against Defendants UNITED SEATING
5 AND MOBILITY, L.L.C., a Missouri corporation; NUMOTION, a business entity of
6 unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively referred to as
7 “Defendants”) for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and California
8 Business and Professions Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants
9 have:

- 10 a. failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;
- 11 b. failed to pay them double time wages at the correct rate;
- 12 c. failed to pay them overtime and/or double time wages by failing to
13 include all applicable remuneration in calculating the regular rate
14 of pay;
- 15 d. failed to provide them with meal periods;
- 16 e. failed to provide them with rest periods;
- 17 f. failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and rest periods;
- 18 g. failed to pay them proper sick time pay;
- 19 h. failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements;
- 20 i. failed to reimburse them with necessary business expenditures; and
- 21 j. failed to pay them all their final wages following separation of
22 employment.

23 Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class
24 action to recover unpaid wages, liquidated damages, penalties, restitution, and related
25 relief on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, and the general public.

26 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

27 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the
28 monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff from Defendants’ conduct

1 exceeds the minimal jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.

2 3. Venue is proper in the County of Orange pursuant to Code of Civil
3 Procedure sections 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose this county because at least
4 some of the transactions that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein
5 and/or each defendant is found, maintains offices, transacts business and/or has an
6 agent therein.

7 4. Venue is proper in Santa Orange because Defendants' have at all times
8 alleged herein, conducted business in Orange County, and throughout California. As
9 such, venue is proper in any county in California.

10 **PARTIES**

11 5. Plaintiff DUSTIN SMITH is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein,
12 an individual residing in the State of California.

13 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant
14 UNITED SEATING AND MOBILITY, L.L.C. is, and at all relevant times mentioned
15 herein, a Missouri corporation doing business in the State of California.

16 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant
17 NUMOTION is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a business entity of
18 unknown form doing business in the State of California.

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

28 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all

1 relevant times mentioned herein, some or all of the defendants were the representatives,
2 agents, employees, partners, directors, associates, joint venturers, joint employers,
3 owners, principals or co-participants of some or all of the other defendants, and in doing
4 the things alleged herein, were acting within the course and scope of such relationship
5 and with the full knowledge, consent, and ratification by such other defendants.

6 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all
7 relevant times mentioned herein, some of the defendants pursued a common course of
8 conduct, acted in concert and conspired with one another, and aided and abetted one
9 another to accomplish the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged herein.

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

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

- 17 a. **Hourly Employee Class:** All persons employed by Defendants,
18 collectively or separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any
19 other third parties in hourly or non-exempt positions in California from
February 29, 2021 and ending on the date that final judgment is entered
in this action (“Hourly Employee Class”).
- 20 b. **Meal Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
21 worked in a shift in excess of five hours from February 29, 2021 and
ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 22 c.
- 23 d. **Rest Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
24 worked a shift of at least three and one-half (3.5) hours from February
25 29, 2021 and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
26 action.
- 27 e. **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class**
28 members who separated from their employment with Defendants
during the period beginning three years before the filing of this action
and ending when final judgment is entered.
- f. **Wage Statement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in
California during the period beginning one year before the filing of this
action and ending when final judgment is entered.

- 1
- 2 g. **Expense Reimbursement Class:** All persons employed by
- 3 Defendants in California who incurred business expenses from
- 4 February 29, 2021 and ending on the date that final judgment is entered
- 5 in this action.
- 6 h. **UCL Sick Pay Class:** All persons employed by Defendants,
- 7 collectively or separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any
- 8 other third parties in hourly or non-exempt positions in California from
- 9 February 29, 2020 and ending on the date that final judgment is entered
- 10 in this action, and who accumulated sick pay and sick time employed
- 11 by Defendants.
- 12 i. **UCL Restitution Class:** All persons employed by Defendants,
- 13 collectively or separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any
- 14 other third parties in hourly or non-exempt positions in California from
- 15 February 29, 2020 through February 28, 2021.

16 13. **Reservation of Rights:** Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff

17 reserves the right to amend or modify the class definitions with greater specificity, by

18 further division into sub-classes and/or by limitation to particular issues.

19 14. **Numerosity:** The class members are so numerous that the individual

20 joinder of each individual class member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not

21 currently know the exact number of class members, Plaintiff is informed and believes,

22 and thereupon alleges that the actual number exceeds the minimum required for

23 numerosity under California law.

24 15. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact

25 exist as to all class members and predominate over any questions which affect only

26 individual class members. These common questions include, but are not limited to:

- 27 a. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to
- 28 provide employees with their rest periods;
- 29 b. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to
- 30 provide employees with their meal periods;
- 31 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members
- 32 when they have not been provided with meal and rest periods at the
- 33 appropriate rates of pay;

34 ///

- d. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class members for all time worked;
- e. Whether Defendants failed to pay proper sick time pay;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to provide class members with accurate written wage statements as a result of providing them with written wage statements with inaccurate entries for, among other things, amounts of gross and net wages, and total hours worked;
- g. Whether Defendants applied policies or practices that result in late and/or incomplete final wage payments;
- h. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse class members for all necessary business expenses incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- i. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under Labor Code section 203; and
- j. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition;

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

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

18. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent class

1 members, are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation, and are dedicated
2 to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of Plaintiff and absent class members.

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

15 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 20. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a non-exempt employee during the
17 relevant and statutory periods.

18 21. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to
19 pay Plaintiff and Hourly Employee and UCL Restitution Class Members proper wages
20 and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Plaintiff and Hourly
21 Employee and UCL Restitution Class Members were consistently required to perform
22 work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and
23 Hourly Employee and UCL Restitution Class Members were required to conduct work
24 activities before clocking in, such as moving company tools and maintenance on
25 company vehicles, including fueling, inspecting, cleaning, checking tire pressure and
26 oil level, and other maintenance. Defendants also required Plaintiff and Hourly
27 Employee and UCL Restitution Class Members to move company tools and conduct
28 other work activities after clocking out. Additionally, Plaintiff and Hourly Employee

1 and UCL Restitution Class Members were required to perform work-related activities
2 during unpaid meal periods. Finally, Defendants required Plaintiff and Hourly
3 Employee and UCL Restitution Class Members to use their personal cell phones for
4 work activities off-the-clock. The foregoing and uncompensated time was under the
5 direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

6 22. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and Hourly Employee and UCL
7 Restitution Class Members to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12)
8 hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Plaintiff and Hourly Employee
9 and UCL Restitution Class Members to minimum and overtime wages, which they
10 were systemically denied.

11 23. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying
12 Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class UCL Restitution Class Members the opportunity
13 to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law. Specifically, due to
14 understaffing and heavy workloads, including the pre-shift duties discussed above,
15 Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class UCL Restitution Class Members were denied the
16 opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of
17 work and second meal periods prior to the completion of the tenth hour of work.
18 Furthermore, Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class UCL Restitution Class Members
19 were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to
20 keep working during meal breaks.

21 24. Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class UCL Restitution Class Members
22 were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5)
23 hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as
24 part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees
25 to take their meal periods, or that advised Meal Period Sub-Class UCL Restitution
26 Class Members of their meal and rest period rights; and (3) Defendants' practice of
27 requiring putative class members to continue working through their meal and rest
28 periods due to the excessive workload.

1 25. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying
2 Plaintiff and Rest Period Sub-Class UCL Restitution Class Members the opportunity
3 to take rest periods in compliance with the California Law. Plaintiff and Rest Period
4 Sub-Class UCL Restitution Class Members were not provided with rest periods of at
5 least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due
6 to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift,
7 including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more and third rest breaks for
8 shifts of ten (10) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that
9 encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Plaintiff and
10 Rest Period Sub-Class UCL Restitution Class Members of their rest period rights; and
11 (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue
12 working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload.

13 26. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Rest Period Sub-
14 Class, Meal Period Sub-Class, and UCL Restitution Class Members premium pay
15 wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

16 27. Plaintiff and Wage Statement Class Members were not provided with
17 accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226.
18 Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage statements as "a detachable part of the
19 check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid
20 by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing." Additionally,
21 the wage statements issued to Plaintiff and Wage Statement Class Members were not
22 recorded in "ink or other indelible form."

23 28. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as "gross
24 wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including
25 overtime, were not included.

26 29. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as "total
27 hours worked by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked,
28 including overtime, were not included.

1 30. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as “net
2 wages earned” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including
3 overtime, were not included.

4 31. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as “all
5 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number
6 of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee” were not accurately reflected in
7 that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

8 32. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Wage Statement
9 Class Members with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage
10 Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters. Plaintiff’s and Wage Statement Class Members’
11 wage statement were only provided in electronic format in violation of Labor Code §
12 226.

13 33. Plaintiff and Expense Reimbursement and UCL Restitution Class
14 Members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in executing their duties
15 under Defendant’s employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and Expense Reimbursement and
16 UCL Restitution Class Members were required to use their personal cell phones for
17 work-related activities, incurring costs for phone and internet use and phone
18 maintenance. Additionally, Defendants required Plaintiff and Expense Reimbursement
19 and UCL Restitution Class Members to use their personal funds to wash and maintain
20 company vehicles. Defendants never reimbursed Plaintiff and Expense Reimbursement
21 and UCL Restitution Class Members for these necessary work expenses.

22 34. Finally, Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically
23 failing to pay Plaintiff and UCL Sick Pay Class Members the requisite sick time pay in
24 accordance with California Law. Specifically, Plaintiff and UCL Sick Pay Class
25 Members worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least one
26 hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12
27 month period of work.

28 ///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS
(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1174, and 1198)
(Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class)

35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

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

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

38. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“Wage Order”) both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work during required meal periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of premium wages on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required meal period.

39. Compensation for missed meal periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor Code section 200.

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

41. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:

No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more

1 than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal
2 period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and
3 employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during
4 a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered
5 an 'on duty' meal period and counted as time worked. An
6 'on duty' meal period shall be permitted only when the nature
of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all
duty and when by written agreement between the parties an
on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written
agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing,
revoke the agreement at any time.

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

11 43. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations
12 period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and
13 members of the **Meal Period Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for
14 at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period, as required by Labor
15 Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order. Specifically, due to understaffing
16 and heavy workloads, including the pre-shift duties discussed above, Plaintiff and **Meal**
17 **Period Sub-Class** members were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods
18 prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work and second meal periods prior to the
19 completion of the tenth hour of work. Furthermore, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-**
20 **Class** members were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and
21 were required to keep working during meal breaks.

22 44. Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with
23 meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to
24 (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift;
25 (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods,
26 or that advised **Meal Period Sub-Class** members of their meal and rest period rights;
27 and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring **Meal Period Sub-Class** members to continue
28 working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

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

5 46. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations
6 period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and
7 members of the **Meal Period Sub-Class** with a second meal period when they worked
8 shifts of ten (10) or more hours and failed to pay them premium wages as required by
9 Labor Code 512 and the applicable Wage Order.

10 47. Moreover, Defendants written policies fail to inform Meal period Class
11 Members of their meal period rights under the Labor Code and applicable Wage
12 Orders.

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

17 49. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf
18 of himself and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium
19 wages, interest thereon, and costs of suit for the period from March 1, 2021 and ending
20 on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.

21 50. Pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq. **UCL Restitution**
22 **Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, through restitution, interest
23 thereon, and costs of suit for the period from February 29, 2020 to February 28, 2021.

24 51. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section
25 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on
26 behalf of himself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** and **UCL Restitution Class**
27 members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

28 ///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS
(Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198)
(Plaintiff and Rest Period Sub-Class)

52. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

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

54. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order imposes an affirmative obligation on employers to permit and authorize employees to take required rest periods at a rate of no less than ten (10) minutes of net rest time for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, that must be in the middle of each work period insofar as practicable.

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

56. Compensation for missed rest periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor Code section 200.

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

58. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing members of the **Rest Period Sub-Class** with net rest period of at least ten (10) uninterrupted minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, as required by the applicable Wage Order.

1 59. Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with rest
2 periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction
3 thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each
4 work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more and third
5 rest breaks for shifts of ten (10) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest
6 period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly
7 advised Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members of their rest period rights; and
8 (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring **Rest Period Sub-Class** members to
9 continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload.

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

13 61. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf
14 of himself and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium
15 wages, interest thereon, and costs of suit for the period from March 1, 2021 and ending
16 on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.

17 62. Pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq., **UCL Restitution**
18 **Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, through restitution, interest
19 thereon, and costs of suit for the period from February 29, 2020 to February 28, 2021.

20 63. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section
21 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on
22 behalf of himself and **Rest Period Sub-Class** and **UCL Restitution Class** members,
23 seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO PAY HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES**

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

27 **(Plaintiff and Hourly Employee Class)**

28 64. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully

1 alleged herein.

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

5 66. Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order defines “hours worked” as “the
6 time during which an employee is subject to the control of the employer, and includes
7 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to
8 do so.”

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

13 68. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer
14 and an employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under
15 the applicable Wage Order.

16 69. Labor Code section 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover
17 liquidated damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and
18 interest thereon in addition to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest
19 thereon.

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

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

27 72. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ
28 employees under conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

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

6 74. Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for employers to pay their
7 employees lower wages than required by contract or statute while purporting to pay
8 them legal wages.

9 75. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order
10 require employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than one
11 and one-half (1.5) times their respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in
12 excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours
13 in one workweek, and/or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive
14 day of one workweek.

15 76. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order also
16 require employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than two
17 (2) times their respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve
18 (12) hours in one workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on a
19 seventh consecutive workday during the workweek.

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

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

26 79. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were not paid proper
27 wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Plaintiff and
28 **Hourly Employee Class** members were consistently required to perform work, off-

1 the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly**
2 **Employee Class** members were required to conduct work activities before clocking in,
3 such as moving company tools and maintenance on company vehicles, including
4 fueling, inspecting, cleaning, checking tire pressure and oil level, and other
5 maintenance. Defendants also required Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members
6 to move company tools and conduct other work activities after clocking out.
7 Additionally, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were required to perform
8 work-related activities during unpaid meal periods. Finally, Defendants required
9 Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to use their personal cell phones for
10 work activities off-the-clock. The foregoing and uncompensated time was under the
11 direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

12 80. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
13 members to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or
14 forty (40) hours a week, entitling Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to
15 minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

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

20 82. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 218.6, 223, 510, 1194 and 1194.2,
21 Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover
22 unpaid straight time and overtime wages, liquidated damages, interest thereon and costs
23 of suit for the period from March 1, 2021 and ending on the date that final judgement
24 is entered in this action.

25 83. Pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq., **UCL Restitution**
26 **Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, through restitution, interest
27 thereon, and costs of suit for the period from February 29, 2020 to February 28, 2021.

28 84. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section

1 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on
2 behalf of himself and **Hourly Employee UCL Restitution Class** members, seeks to
3 recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

4 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS**

6 **(Lab. Code § 226)**

7 **(Plaintiff and Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class)**

8 85. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
9 alleged herein.

10 86. Labor Code section 226(a) states:

11 An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of
12 wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a
13 detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the
14 employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by
15 personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in
16 writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
17 worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision
18 (j), (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any
19 applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate
20 basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made
21 on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and
22 shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive
23 dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
24 name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or
25 her social security number or an employee identification
26 number other than a social security number, (8) the name and
27 address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the
28 employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision
(b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity
that secured the services of the employer, and (9) all
applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate
by the employee and, beginning July 1, 2013, if the employer
is a temporary services employer as defined in Section 201.3,
the rate of pay and the total hours worked for each temporary
services assignment. The deductions made from payment of
wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form,
properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy
of the statement and the record of the deductions shall be kept
on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of
employment or at a central location within the State of
California. For purposes of this subdivision, 'copy' includes
a duplicate of the itemized statement provided to an
employee or a computer-generated record that accurately
shows all of the information required by this subdivision.

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

8 88. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the
9 applicable limitations period, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage**
10 **Statement Class** members with written wage statements as described above.
11 Additionally, the wage statements issued to class members failed to account for the
12 unpaid minimum wages, overtime, and premium pay wages described above.

13 89. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement**
14 **Class** Members with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable
15 Wage Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters. Plaintiff’s and **Wage Statement Class**
16 members’ wage statements were only provided in electronic format in violation of
17 Labor Code § 226.

18 90. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(8) as the
19 wage statements issues to Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** Members failed to state
20 “the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.”

21 91. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants’ failure to provide
22 Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members with accurate written wage statements
23 was intentional in that Defendants have the ability to provide them with accurate wage
24 statements but have intentionally provided them with written wage statements that
25 Defendants have known do not comply with Labor Code section 226(a).

26 92. Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members have suffered injuries, in
27 that Defendants have violated their legal rights to receive accurate wage statements and
28 have misled them about their actual rates of pay and wages earned. In addition,

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

7 93. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226(e), Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and
8 **Wage Statement Class** members, seeks the greater of actual damages or \$50.00 for
9 the initial pay period in which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, and
10 \$100.00 for each subsequent pay period in which a violation of Labor Code section
11 226(a) occurred, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of \$4000.00 per class member, as
12 well as awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

13 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL FINAL WAGES**

15 **(Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**

16 **(Plaintiff and Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class)**

17 94. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
18 alleged herein.

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

22 96. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 201, employees who
23 have been discharged have been entitled to payment of all final wages immediately
24 upon termination.

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

28 98. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the

1 applicable limitations period, Defendants have failed to timely pay **Waiting Time**
2 **Penalties Sub-Class** members all their final wages in accordance with the Labor Code.

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

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

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

17 102. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit
18 doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **Waiting**
19 **Time Penalties Sub-Class** members, seeks awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and
20 costs.

21 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY**

23 **(Lab. Code § 2802)**

24 **(Plaintiff and Reimbursement Class)**

25 103. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
26 alleged herein.

27 104. Labor Code section 2802(a) states:

28 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all

1 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in
2 direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of
3 his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even
4 though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying
5 the directions, believed them to be unlawful.

6 105. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not
7 reimbursed for business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant's
8 employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were
9 required to use their personal cell phones for work-related activities, incurring costs for
10 phone and internet use and phone maintenance. Additionally, Defendants required
11 Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members to use their personal funds to
12 wash and maintain company vehicles. Defendants never reimbursed Plaintiff and
13 **Expense Reimbursement Class** members for these necessary work expenses.

14 106. Accordingly, under Labor Code section 2802, Plaintiff and **Expense**
15 **Reimbursement Class** members are entitled to restitution for all unpaid amounts due
16 and owing to during the period from March 1, 2021 and ending on the date that final
17 judgment is entered in this action.

18 107. Pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq., **UCL Restitution**
19 **Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid amounts, through restitution, interest thereon,
20 and costs of suit for the period from February 29, 2020 to February 28, 2021.

21 108. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, and **Expense Reimbursement and UCL**
22 **Restitution Class** members, seeks interest thereon and costs pursuant to Labor
23 Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Code of Civil
24 Procedure section 1021.5.

25 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **UNFAIR COMPETITION FOR SICK PAY PRACTICES**

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

28 **(Plaintiff and UCL Sick Pay Class)**

109. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
alleged herein.

1 110. Business and Professions Code section 17200 defines “unfair
2 competition” to include any unlawful business practice.

3 111. Business and Professions Code sections 17203-17204 allow a person who
4 has lost money or property as a result of unfair competition to bring a class action in
5 accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 382 to recover money or property that
6 may have been acquired from similarly situated persons by means of unfair
7 competition.

8 112. California law requires employers to pay employees at least one hour of
9 sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 sick days of sick time for every 12
10 month period of work.

11 113. Labor Code Section 246 affords an employee “who works in California
12 for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment [] paid
13 sick days . . . of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked” and “no less than
14 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of
15 employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month period.”

16 114. Additionally, Subsection (l) of Section 246 provides:

17 For the purposes of this section, an employer shall calculate paid
18 sick leave using any of the following calculations:

19 (1) Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated
20 in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek
21 in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the
22 employee actually works overtime in that workweek.

23 115. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to
24 pay Plaintiff and Class Members the requisite sick time pay in accordance with
25 California Law. Specifically, Plaintiff and **UCL Sick Pay Class** members worked for
26 Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for
27 every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12 month period of
28 work.

///

1 116. Plaintiff lost money or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair
2 competition.

3 117. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair
4 competition.

5 118. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants
6 violated Labor Code section 246, as well as applicable Wage Orders, which make it a
7 misdemeanor to commit the violations alleged herein.

8 119. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and
9 practices of, *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an
10 employer to provide proper sick time pay.

11 120. Additionally, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that
12 by committing the Labor Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants
13 violated Labor Code section 246 as well as applicable Wage Orders, which make it a
14 misdemeanor to commit the violations alleged herein.

15 121. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and
16 practices of, *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an
17 employer to: provide non-exempt employees with sick pay under Labor Code Section
18 246.

19 122. Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged in this Complaint amounts to and
20 constitutes unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code
21 section 17200 *et seq.* Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* protects
22 against unfair competition and allows a person who has suffered an injury-in-fact and
23 has lost money or property as a result of an unfair, unlawful or fraudulent business
24 practice to seek restitution on his own behalf and on behalf of similarly situated persons
25 in a class action proceeding.

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

1 property as a result of Defendants' conduct.

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

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

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

12 127. Accordingly, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200
13 and 17203, Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent
14 injunctive relief enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and
15 employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

16 128. Accordingly, pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200 and 17203,
17 Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive
18 relief enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from
19 further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
20 Wage Orders; and upon a final hearing seeks an order permanently enjoining
21 Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and employees, from further
22 violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
23 Orders.

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

28 130. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit

1 doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Sick Pay Class** members
2 are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair
3 competition claims.

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

8 132. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit
9 doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Sick Pay Class** members
10 are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair
11 competition claims.

12 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **UNFAIR COMPETITION FOR DERIVATIVE CLAIMS**

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

15 **(Plaintiff and UCL Restitution Class)**

16 133. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
17 alleged herein.

18 134. Business and Professions Code section 17200 defines "unfair
19 competition" to include any unlawful business practice.

20 135. Business and Professions Code sections 17203-17204 allow a person who
21 has lost money or property as a result of unfair competition to bring a class action in
22 accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 382 to recover money or property that
23 may have been acquired from similarly situated persons by means of unfair
24 competition.

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

28 137. Plaintiff and the **UCL Restitution Class** members re-allege and

1 incorporate the FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, and SIXTH causes of action herein.

2 138. Plaintiff lost money or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair
3 competition.

4 139. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair
5 competition.

6 140. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that by
7 committing the Labor Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants violated
8 Labor Code sections 215, 216, 225, 226.6, 226.7, 354, 408, 512, 510, 553, 1175, 1174,
9 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2802 as well as applicable Wage Orders,
10 which make it a misdemeanor to commit the violations alleged herein.

11 141. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and
12 practices of, *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an
13 employer to: provide non-exempt employees with compliant meal and rest periods; pay
14 for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay; and reimbursement for necessary
15 business expenditures.

16 142. Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged in this Complaint amounts to and
17 constitutes unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code
18 section 17200 *et seq.* Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* protects
19 against unfair competition and allows a person who has suffered an injury-in-fact and
20 has lost money or property as a result of an unfair, unlawful or fraudulent business
21 practice to seek restitution on his own behalf and on behalf of similarly situated persons
22 in a class action proceeding.

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

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

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

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

9 147. Accordingly, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200
10 and 17203, Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent
11 injunctive relief enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and
12 employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

13 148. Accordingly, pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200 and 17203,
14 Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive
15 relief enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from
16 further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
17 Wage Orders; and upon a final hearing seeks an order permanently enjoining
18 Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and employees, from further
19 violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
20 Orders.

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

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

151. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and **UCL Restitution Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful and unfair business practices from the period beginning on February 29, 2020 and ending on February 28, 2021.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. An order that the action be certified as a class action;
- b. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;
- c. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;
- d. Unpaid wages and overtime;
- e. Actual damages;
- f. Liquidated damages;
- g. Unreimbursed expenses;
- h. Restitution;
- i. Declaratory relief;
- j. Pre-judgment interest;
- k. Statutory penalties;

///

///

///

///

- 1 l. Costs of suit;
- 2 m. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- 3 n. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.
- 4

5 Dated: May 2, 2024

D.LAW, INC.

6
7 /s/David Keledjian

8 Emil Davtyan
9 David Yeremian
10 David Keledjian
11 Kevin Burns
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff
13 DUSTIN SMITH, and the putative class

14 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15 Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, all other similarly situated, and the general public,
16 hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

17 Dated: May 2, 2024

D.LAW, INC.

18
19 /s/David Keledjian

20 Emil Davtyan
21 David Yeremian
22 David Keledjian
23 Kevin Burns
24 Attorneys for Plaintiff
25 DUSTIN SMITH, and the putative class
26
27
28