

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
S. Phillip Song (SBN 326572)
Stanley J. Park (SBN 334747)
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125
kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
psong@moonlawgroup.com
spark@moonlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Senorina Valencia Ayala

Electronically
FILED
by Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
ON **4/30/2024**
By /s/ Hessen Ladcani
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

SENORINA VALENCIA AYALA, individually,
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JANCO FS 3, LLC, a limited liability company;
JANCO FS 2, LLC, a limited liability company;
JANCO FS 4, LLC, a limited liability company;
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 24-CIV-02601

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

1. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff.....	3
B. Defendants.....	3
GENERAL ALLEGATIONS.....	5
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION.....	9
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	11

1 Plaintiff Senorina Valencia Ayala (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have
2 evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for
3 further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants JanCo FS 3, LLC, JanCo FS 2, LLC,
6 JanCo FS 4, LLC, and Does 1 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for civil
7 penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698 et seq.
8 (“PAGA”) stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime
9 wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to
10 maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to pay all accrued vacation
11 wages at termination, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify
12 necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate wage statements.

13 2. For over 50 years, California’s courts and legislature have recognized that this
14 State’s wage-and-hour laws serve a compelling public interest of fostering a stable job market.
15 Wages are not ordinary debts. Because of the economic position of the average worker and his or
16 her family, it is essential to the public welfare that employers obey the wage-and-hour laws so that
17 employees are promptly paid the minimum/overtime wages that the Legislature has required for
18 employees. So fundamental are California’s wage-and-hour laws that the Legislature has
19 criminalized certain types of violations. In extending extra protection to deter violations of these
20 underlying statutes—since Plaintiff is not seeking general and/or special damages, restitution or
21 other damages other than civil penalties—California has enacted the PAGA to permit an individual
22 to bring an action on behalf of herself and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties only, which is
23 the precise and sole nature of this action.

24 3. All California employees during the relevant statutes of limitations who are or were
25 harmed by Defendant’s illegal practices are “Aggrieved Employees.”

26 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties for
27 herself, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the
28 State of California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by

1 California Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are
2 mentioned for wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or special damages
3 for those violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699,
4 declaratory relief, and injunctive relief for herself and all Aggrieved Employees as permitted by
5 the PAGA.

6 5. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
7 establishment within the State of California, including Orange County. As such, and based upon
8 all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are
9 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
10 ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

11 6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants maintained
12 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 13 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
14 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
15 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 16 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
17 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
18 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing
19 to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation
20 occurred;
- 21 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
22 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
23 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
24 period violation occurred;
- 25 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 26 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
27 meal period premium wages, rest period premium wages, and accrued
28

vacation wages due within the time period specified by California law when employment terminates; and

(f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked.

(g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

7. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

8. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

9. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Sacramento, State of California, as a production employee from approximately April 2022 to December 2023.

10. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

B. Defendants

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendants are:

(a) Business entities with their principal places of business in Sacramento, California.

- 1 (b) Business entities conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
2 State of California, including in Sacramento County;
- 3 (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employer of
4 the Aggrieved Employees. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and
5 the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or
6 working conditions;
- 7 (d) At all times mentioned herein, Defendants are and were the joint employers
8 of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

9 12. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or
10 entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious
11 names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages
12 suffered by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this
13 complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been
14 ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

15 13. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
16 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
17 injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of
18 California.

19 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each
20 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the
21 other employees described in the Aggrieved Employees definitions below, and exercised control
22 over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
23 alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer,
24 officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in
25 interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with
26 some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships
27 to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters
28 alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted

1 pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or
2 should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and
3 abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

4 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 15. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of
6 Sacramento, State of California, as a production employee during the statutory period. During the
7 statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's overtime
8 requirements, and paid Plaintiff an hourly wage.

9 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
10 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
11 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
12 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all final
13 wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
14 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
15 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

16 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
17 paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages.
18 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated.
19 For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to clock into work, which
20 sometimes takes substantial time due to faultiness of the system, leading to off the clock work.
21 Also, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID screenings prior to
22 clocking into work, off the clock (Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to walk
23 long distances in order to obtain their test, and to wait for results, all off the clock and
24 uncompensated). Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to clock out and often
25 travel to other locations, without receiving compensation for that travel time.

26 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
27 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly
28 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day

1 without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five
2 hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods
3 that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did
4 not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period
5 by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth
6 hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing
7 meal periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies
8 or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies
9 or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required
10 meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to
11 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

12 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
13 and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods.
14 Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four
15 consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute,
16 continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four
17 hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were
18 not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
19 Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies
20 or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor
21 did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant
22 also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
23 Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate
24 records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and
25 the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly,
26 Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through
27 rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

1 20. Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all
2 meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

3 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the
4 Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for
5 Defendants without reimbursement, such as the purchase of facemasks, cleaning gloves, the use of
6 personal cellular telephones for work purposes, and vehicles expenses driving from one work
7 location to another work location.

8 22. Throughout the statutory time period, Defendants failed to pay the final paychecks
9 within the statutory time permitted by Labor Code Section 203.

10 23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
11 pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all wages for all
12 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, rest period premium wages, and
13 accrued vacation wages.

14 24. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
15 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates,
16 and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours
17 worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in
18 accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and
19 permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address). Further, the wage
20 statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As a result of these
21 violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered
22 injury because, among other things:

- 23 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
24 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, rest period
25 premium wages, and accrued vacation wages to which they were entitled,
26 even though they were entitled;
27
28

- 1 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
2 overtime, meal period premium, rest period premium wages, and accrued
3 vacation wages even though they had not been;
- 4 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
5 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the
6 correct California rate even though they were;
- 7 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
8 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
9 California rate even though they had not been;
- 10 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
11 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 12 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
13 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
14 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
15 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
16 statements contained the required accurate information;
- 17 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
18 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability,
19 unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- 20 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
21 rates to which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and
22 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and
23 wage rates to which they were entitled.

24 Thus, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California
25 Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of**
3 **2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

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

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

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

15 28. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
16 Code § 2699.3. On February 19, 2024, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor
17 and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions
18 of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved
19 employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations (See attached as **Exhibit A**).
20 Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1011834-24. At the time of this filing, 65 days has
21 elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not
22 indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice.
23 Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699
24 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These
25 penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558,
26 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

27 29. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California Labor
28 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,

1 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by
2 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
3 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins
4 and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.
5 Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total
6 hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

7 30. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees,
8 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to
9 maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when employees
10 begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by
11 the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to
12 know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of
13 their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
14 Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an
15 unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
16 Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment
17 of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel
18 Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts
19 according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code
20 and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an
21 injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments
22 paid to them.

23 31. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award
24 of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved Employees
25 of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown
26 according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.
27
28

1 32. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant
2 to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action
3 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 Plaintiff, on behalf of all similarly Aggrieved Employees, prays for relief and judgment
6 against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

7 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
8 Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and
9 overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods,
10 failing to reimburse business expenses, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to
11 maintain accurate records of all hours worked;

12 2. An award of civil penalties on behalf of himself and all similarly aggrieved
13 employees pursuant to PAGA;

14 3. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;

15 4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;


16 5. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and

17 6. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.
18

19 Dated: April 29, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

20 **MOON LAW GROUP, PC**

21
22 By: 

Kane Moon
S. Phillip Song
Stanley J. Park
Attorneys for Plaintiff Senorina Valencia Ayala
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONLAWGROUP.COM

1055 W. SEVENTH ST., SUITE 1880
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

February 19, 2024

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

JanCo FS 3, LLC
3399 Peachtree Road, NE, Suite 1500
Atlanta, GA 30326

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

JanCo FS 2, LLC
84 Peachtree Road, NE, Suite 8D
Atlanta, GA 30303

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

JanCo FS 4, LLC
950 E. Paces Ferry Road, Suite 2000
Atlanta, GA 30326

Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Senorina Valencia Ayala v. JanCo FS 3, LLC, JanCo FS 2, LLC, and JanCo FS 4, LLC***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Senorina Valencia Ayala (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer, JanCo FS 3, LLC, JanCo FS 2, LLC, and JanCo FS 4, LLC (collectively referred herein as “Defendant”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant’s aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiff as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC").

Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a painter from approximately 2015 to January 2018, primarily in Los Angeles County. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Plaintiff typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to clock into work, which sometimes takes substantial time due to faultiness of the system, leading to off the clock work. Also, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID screenings prior to clocking into work, off the clock (Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to

walk long distances in order to obtain their test, and to wait for results, all off the clock and uncompensated). Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to clock out and often travel to other locations, without receiving compensation for that travel time.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and

complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants without reimbursement, such as the purchase of facemasks, cleaning gloves, the use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes, and vehicles expenses driving from one work location to another work location.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the termination of employment. For instance, when Plaintiff's employment with Defendant terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendant even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendant's policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and

9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kane Moon', is written over the printed name.

Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law