

Lilit Tunyan (SBN 329351)
ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com
Artur Tunyan (SBN 349174)
atunyan@tunyanlaw.com
TUNYAN LAW, APC
535 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 285
Glendale, California 91203
Telephone: (323) 410-5050

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of Placer
05/29/2024 at 12:14:09 PM
By: Robin Hall
Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff NICOLE DEZA as an individual
and on behalf of all employees similarly situated

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

NICOLE DEZA, as an individual and on
behalf of all employees similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

EURO SNACK, INC., a California
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. S-CV-0052505

**Amended as a matter of right, pursuant to
Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(c)**

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

1. Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198 (Failure to Pay All Wages);
2. Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 (Failure to Provide Meal Periods);
3. Violation of Labor Code § 226.7 (Failure to Provide Rest Periods);
4. Violation of Labor Code § 226, 1174 (Failure to Keep Accurate Records and to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements);
5. Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203, (Failure to Pay Wages Upon Termination of Employment);
6. Violation of Labor Code § 2802 (Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Expenditures);
7. Violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. (Unfair Business Practices); and
8. Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code sections 2698, et seq

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff NICOLE DEZA (hereinafter referred to as “Plaintiff”) on behalf of herself and all
2 others similarly situated, as representative of the State of California and the Labor and Workforce
3 Development Agency (“LWDA”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are
4 likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and
5 discovery, complains and alleges as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This is a class action brought on behalf of Plaintiff and the class she seeks to
8 represent (“Class” or “Class Members”). Class Members consist of all non-exempt, hourly-paid
9 employees currently and/or formerly employed by EURO SNACK, INC. in the State of California
10 during the Class Period. The term “Class Period” is defined as four (4) years prior to the filing
11 of this Complaint through the date final judgment is entered. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend
12 this Complaint to reflect a different “Class Period” or “Class” as further discovery is conducted.

13 2. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the class she seeks to represent, seeks relief
14 against EURO SNACK, INC. (“Defendant”) for Defendant’s failure to pay all wages due in
15 violation of Labor Code Sections 204, 510 and 1194, including regular and overtime wages;
16 failure to provide meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof pursuant to Labor Code Sections
17 226.7 and 512, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and Code of
18 Regulations, Title 8, Section 11000 et seq.; failure to provide rest periods or compensation in lieu
19 thereof pursuant to Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, the applicable Industrial Welfare
20 Commission Wage Orders, and Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11000 et seq.; failure to
21 keep accurate records and to provide accurate itemized wage statements upon payment of wages
22 pursuant to Labor Code Sections 226, subdivision (a), 1174, and 1175; failure to reimburse for
23 necessary expenditures pursuant to Labor Code Section 2802; and failure to pay wages of
24 terminated or resigned employees pursuant to Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203.

25 3. Plaintiff seeks equitable remedies in the form of declaratory relief and injunctive
26 relief, and relief under Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. for unfair business
27 practices.

1 4. At all relevant times herein, Defendant has consistently maintained and enforced
2 against Plaintiff and Class the following unlawful practices and policies:

- 3 (a) willfully refusing to pay Plaintiff and Class for all hours worked, including
4 regular and overtime;
5 (b) willfully refusing to permit Plaintiff and Class from taking meal periods or
6 compensation in lieu thereof;
7 (c) willfully refusing to permit Plaintiff and Class from taking rest periods or
8 compensation in lieu thereof;
9 (d) willfully refusing to maintain accurate records and to furnish to Plaintiff and
10 Class accurate itemized wage statements upon payment of wages;
11 (e) willfully refusing to compensate certain members of the Class wages due and
12 owing at the time of Class Members' employment with Defendant ended;
13 and;
14 (f) willfully refusing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class for necessary
15 expenditures.

16 5. On information and belief, Defendant was on actual and constructive notice of
17 the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies.
18 Defendant's violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and
19 deliberate.

20 6. At all relevant times, Defendant was and is legally responsible for all of the
21 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
22 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and Class. Further, Defendant is responsible
23 for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of
24 "respondeat superior".

25 7. Plaintiff further brings this action as a representative of the State of California
26 and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") to recover civil penalties
27 pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), Labor Code sections 2698, et seq.,
28

1 for violations of numerous Labor Code provisions, including, but not limited to, sections 201-
2 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1198 and 2802, as well as violations of the
3 applicable Wage Order.

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 8. Venue is proper in this judicial district and in the County of Placer, California
6 because Defendant maintained its corporate office and/or transacted business in this county, the
7 obligations and liability arise in this county, and work was performed by members of the proposed
8 class made the subject of this action in this county.

9 9. The wages, statutory penalties, monetary damages and restitution sought by
10 Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established
11 according to proof at trial. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California
12 Constitution, article VI, Section 10. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify
13 any other basis for jurisdiction.

14 10. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction in the matter because the individual
15 claims are under the seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00) jurisdictional threshold for
16 Federal Court and the five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00) aggregate jurisdictional threshold for
17 Federal Court and, upon information and belief, Plaintiff and Defendant are residents of,
18 domiciled in, or otherwise subject to jurisdiction in the State of California. Further, there is no
19 federal question at issue as the issues herein are based solely on California statutes and law
20 including the Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders, the Code of
21 Civil Procedure, the Rules of Court, and the Business and Professions Code.

22 **THE PARTIES**

23 **A. Plaintiff**

24 11. Plaintiff, at all relevant times herein, was Defendant's employee and was entitled
25 to compensation for all hours worked, including regular time and overtime compensation, and
26 penalties from Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a non-exempt, hourly paid
27 employee during the Class Period. Specifically, Plaintiff worked as a cook and cleaner from
28 August 8, 2022 to April 16, 2023. Each of the Class Members are identifiable, current and/or

former similarly situated persons who were employed in non-exempt hourly positions in California by Defendant during the Class Period.

B. Defendant

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant is a corporation doing business in California. On information and belief, Defendant was and/or is the employer of Plaintiff and Class during the Class Period. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendant is conducting business in good standing in California.

13. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships and extent of participation in the conduct herein alleged of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that these Defendants are legally responsible for the payment of overtime compensation, rest and meal period compensation, and wages to Plaintiff and Class by virtue of their unlawful practices, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of each DOE Defendants when ascertained.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendant, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendant. Furthermore, Defendants in all respects acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and Class.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all respects as the agent, servant, partner, joint venture, alter-ego, employee, proxy, managing agent, and/or principal of the Defendant, and in performing the actions mentioned below was acting, at least in part, within the course and scope of that authority as such agent, proxy, servant, partner, joint venture, employee, alter-ego, managing agent, and/or principal with permission and consent of the Defendant. Plaintiff also alleges the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendant.

16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendant sued herein was, at all times relevant hereto, the employer, owner, shareholder,

principal, joint venture, proxy, agent, employee, supervisor, representative, manager, managing agent, joint employer and/or alter-ego of the remaining Defendant, and was acting, at least in part, within the course and scope of such employment and agency, with the express and implied permission, consent, and knowledge, approval and/or ratification of the other Defendant.

ADMINISTRATIVE PREREQUISITE

17. On March 23, 2024, prior to filing this complaint, Plaintiff gave written notice by electronically filing the notice with the Labor Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") (LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1018247-24) and by certified mail to Defendant of the specified provisions alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations as required by Labor Code Section 2699.3.

18. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's letter sent to the LWDA dated March 23, 2024, is attached hereto as "**Exhibit A**". As of the filing of this complaint, LWDA has not responded to the written notice.

19. Under Labor Code Section 2699.3 subsection (a), a plaintiff may bring a cause of action under PAGA only after giving notice to the Labor Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and the employer of the Labor Code Sections alleged to have been violated, and after receiving notice from the LWDA of its intention not to investigate, or after 65 days have passed without notice.

20. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed without notice from the LWDA. Accordingly, all administrative prerequisites for filing this First Amended Complaint have been fulfilled.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

21. Plaintiff was employed as a cook and cleaner from August 8, 2022 to April 16, 2023.

22. Labor Code Section 1194 provides that notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, an employee receiving less than the legal overtime compensation is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of his or her overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

23. Labor Code Section 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (a) labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (d) the requirements of this Section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Plaintiff and Class were also 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. Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees at the regularly set pay days and often times paid late, failed to pay 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.

24. Further, Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that any person who engages in unfair competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. Business and Professions Code Section 17204 provides that any person who has suffered actual injury and has lost money or property as a result of the unfair competition may bring an action in a court of competent jurisdiction.

25. During all, or a portion of the Class Period, Plaintiff and each member of the Class was employed by Defendant in the State of California.

26. Plaintiff and Class Members were non-exempt employees covered under one or more IWC Wage Order(s), and Labor Code Section 510, and/or other applicable Wage Orders, regulations and statutes, and each Class Member was not subject to an exemption for executive, administrative or professional employees, which imposed obligations on the part of Defendant to pay Plaintiff and Class Members lawful overtime compensation.

1 27. Plaintiff and Class were covered by one or more IWC Wage Order(s), and Labor
2 Code Section 226.7 and other applicable Wage Orders, regulations and statutes which imposed
3 an obligation on the part of Defendant to pay Plaintiff and Class rest and meal period
4 compensation.

5 28. During the Class Period, Defendant were obligated to pay Plaintiff and Class
6 Members overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours of work in one
7 (1) day or forty (40) hours in one (1) week and double-time compensation for hours worked in
8 excess of twelve (12) in one (1) day. However, often times Plaintiff and Class Members were
9 required to work overtime in excess of eight (8) hours per workday and in excess of forty (40)
10 hours per workweek but were not paid at the proper overtime rate of pay.

11 29. During the Class Period, Defendant was obligated to pay Plaintiff and Class
12 Members for all hours worked. However, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members
13 for all hours worked at the legally mandated wage rates, including regular wages and overtime
14 wages. Plaintiff and Class Members received additional remuneration in the form of gift cards.
15 However, Defendant has not compensated Plaintiff and Class Members at the proper overtime
16 and sick pay rate. Defendant did not include the additional remuneration paid to Plaintiff and
17 Class Members in the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating overtime rate of pay and
18 sick pay. Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also maintained a policy and practice of
19 requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to perform work “off-the-clock”. During the statutory
20 period Defendant’s policy and practice required Plaintiff and Class Members to enter the
21 worksite and immediately don their uniforms, among other things, in a restroom before
22 clocking in for work and doff their uniforms after clocking out for their shifts. Defendant did
23 not compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for donning and doffing time. Defendant
24 regularly required Plaintiff and Class Members to arrive early to stay in line with other
25 employees to clock in to work by recording their time on a paper timesheet but did not
26 compensate for that time. Additionally, Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ supervisors would
27 enter employees’ time into a spreadsheet on the computer based on the time recorded on the
28

1 handwritten timesheets. However, often time Defendant's supervisors would input on the
2 computer less time than Plaintiff and Class Members recorded on their timesheets. Plaintiff
3 complained about the missing hours to her supervisor. Defendant further failed to compensate
4 Plaintiff and Class Members for off-the-clock work such as answering work related calls and
5 text messages regarding their schedule and work assignments on their personal phones outside
6 of their shift hours. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendant failed
7 to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and Class Members worked. In doing so,
8 Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and Class Members
9 worked.

10 30. During the Class Period, Defendant was obligated to provide Plaintiff and Class
11 with a work-free meal period within the first five (5) hours of a shift no later than the start of
12 sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-
13 free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Here,
14 Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with legally compliant meal
15 periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of five
16 consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free
17 meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and Class Members
18 for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work.
19 In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members had their
20 meal periods missed, late, interrupted, rounded, shortened, automatically deducted, on-duty,
21 and/or restricted to the worksite due to Defendant's work demands, understaffing, policies, and
22 practices. Further, Plaintiff and Class Members had to interrupt their first meal periods to unload
23 products for Defendant from the truck during meal periods or take their meal periods at the end
24 of their shifts instead of taking them before the end of the fifth hour of their work due to work
25 demands. In addition, Defendant failed to provide second meal periods when Class Members
26 worked in excess of 10 hours in a workday. Defendant also failed to compensate Plaintiff and
27 Class Members with an additional hour of pay at their regular rate for every day in which they
28

suffered a meal period violation. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and Class Members in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and Class Members in compliance with California law.

31. Additionally, Defendant were obligated to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with a ten (10) minute rest break for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked each day. Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and Class Members to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and Class Members 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 Class Members for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Plaintiff and Class Members regularly had their rest breaks missed, shortened, late, on-duty, restricted to the worksite, and/or interrupted. In addition, Defendant failed to provide third rest breaks when Plaintiff and Class Members worked in excess of 10 hours in a workday. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and Class Members to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

32. Furthermore, Defendant failed and/or refused to pay Plaintiff and Class Members one (1) hour's pay at the employees' regular rate of pay as premium compensation for Defendant's failure to provide lawful thirty (30) minute, off-duty meal periods and failure to provide lawful ten (10) minute rest periods within the statutory time frames.

33. Defendant also failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members all necessary expenditures incurred in direct discharge of their duties without reimbursement. During the Class Period, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to purchase and maintain their uniforms out of their own pocket. Plaintiff and Class Members were reimbursed for the uniform only if they returned the uniform. Plaintiff and Class Members would also use their personal cell phones to communicate with supervisors regarding their work assignments for the next day and their schedules and send photos of the completed assignments to supervisors but were not compensated

1 for a reasonable portion of their personal cell phone bills. Plaintiff and Class Members incurred
2 these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and
3 Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members for these employment-related
4 expenses.

5 34. Defendant continues to employ non-exempt, hourly-paid employees within
6 California.

7 35. Plaintiff and Class Members primarily performed non-exempt work, often in
8 excess of the maximum regular rate hours set forth in the applicable IWC Wage Order(s),
9 regulations or statutes, and therefore entitled the Plaintiff and Class Members to overtime
10 compensation at the rate of one and a half times their regular rate of pay and, when applicable,
11 double time compensation as set forth by the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), regulations and/or
12 statutes.

13 36. During the Class Period, Defendant required Plaintiff and Class Members to work
14 regular hours, off the clock hours, and overtime hours without lawful compensation in violation
15 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), regulations and statutes, and Defendant: (1) willfully failed
16 and refused, and continue to fail and refuse to pay compensation for all hours worked, including
17 lawful regular time and overtime compensation, to Class Members; and (2) willfully failed and
18 refused, and continue to fail and refuse to pay due and owing wages promptly upon termination
19 of employment to Plaintiff and affected Class Members.

20 37. Class Members who ended their employment with Defendant during the Class
21 Period but were not paid the above due compensation for all hours worked timely upon the
22 termination of their employment as required by Labor Code Sections 201, 202, and 203 are
23 entitled to penalties as provided by Labor Code Section 203.

24 38. During the Class Period, Defendant failed to furnish Plaintiff and Class Members
25 with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and
26 net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked,
27 correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in
28 accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and

permitted to take in accordance with California law). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and Class Members are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

39. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class members were entitled to receive accurate wage statements, which would include meal break premiums, and/or rest break premiums, as required by Labor Code 226.

40. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to timely payment of all wages earned upon termination. Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive payment of all wages, including but not limited to, meal and rest break premiums, in violation of the Labor Code.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

41. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated persons as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 382. The Class is composed of and defined as follows:

- (a) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and were not paid all wages owed, including but not limited to the legally requisite regular time rate, overtime rate and/or double-time rate;
- (b) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not been provided a meal period for shifts in excess of five (5) hours within the first five (5) hours such shifts, and were not provided one (1) hour's pay for each day during which a lawful meal period was not provided;
- (c) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not

1 been provided a rest period for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof,
2 worked per day, and were not provided compensation of one (1) hour's pay for
3 each day on which such rest period(s) was not provided;

4 (d) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
5 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
6 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have not
7 been reimbursed expenditures in discharge of their duties;

8 (e) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
9 State of California, and who, within the three (3) years of the filing of this
10 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and have
11 been terminated or resigned, and have not been paid wages pursuant to Labor
12 Code Section 203 and are owed restitution and waiting time penalties for
13 unpaid wages;

14 (f) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
15 State of California, and who, within the one (1) year of the filing of this
16 Complaint to the present have worked as non-exempt employees and were not
17 provided an accurate payroll record or wage statement as required under Labor
18 Code Sections 226 and 1174;

19 (g) All persons who are employed or have been employed by Defendant in the
20 State of California, and who, within the four (4) years of the filing of this
21 Complaint to the present, have worked as non-exempt employees and were
22 subjected to unlawful and unfair business practices within the meaning of
23 California's Unfair Competition Law and who suffered injury, including lost
24 money, as a result of Defendant's unlawful and unfair business practices.

25 42. Throughout discovery in this litigation, Plaintiff may find it appropriate and/or
26 necessary to amend the definition of the Class. Plaintiff will formally define and designate a class
27 definition at such time when Plaintiff seeks to certify the Class alleged in this Complaint.
28

1 43. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to
2 Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because there is a well-defined common interest of many
3 persons and it is impractical to bring them all before the court.

4 44. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
5 Code of Civil Procedure Section 382 because:

- 6 (a) The questions of law and fact common to Class predominate over any
7 question affecting only individual class members;
- 8 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
9 efficient adjudication of the claims of the Class members;
- 10 (c) Class is so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the
11 Class before the Court;
- 12 (d) Plaintiff and Class Members will not be able to obtain effective and
13 economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- 14 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
15 equitable relief for the common law and statutory violations and other
16 improprieties and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages
17 and injuries which Defendant's actions have inflicted upon Class;
- 18 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets and
19 available insurance of the Defendant are sufficient to adequately
20 compensate Class Members for the injuries sustained;
- 21 (g) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by
22 individual members of the Class would create a risk of:
 - 23 (1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
24 members of the Class which would establish an incompatible
25 standard of conduct for Defendant; and/or
 - 26 (2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which
27 would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other
28 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially

1 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including
2 but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available
3 from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendant; and
4 (h) Defendant have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
5 Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
6 Class as a whole.

7 45. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and Class is
8 readily ascertainable:

- 9 (a) Numerosity: The members of Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
10 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
11 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time,
12 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the
13 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
14 Defendant's records.
- 15 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the
16 interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined
17 community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical
18 of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.
- 19 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
20 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
21 defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated
22 herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class
23 Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the
24 rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.
25 Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will
26 continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be
27 necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
28

benefit of each class member.

(d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

1. The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
2. The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;
3. The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and
4. The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

(e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

46. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. Defendant's own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as

published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay All Wages for All Hours Worked

(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)

47. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

48. Labor Code Section 510, subdivision (a) states in pertinent part: "Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek... shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for any employee."

49. Labor Code Section 1194, subdivision (a) states: "Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit."

50. Further, pursuant to Labor Code Section 1197, payment of less than the minimum wage fixed by the Labor Commission is unlawful.

51. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer than the hours set by the Industrial Welfare Commission or under conditions prohibited by the IWC Wage Order(s).

52. Pursuant to the IWC Wage Order(s), Defendant is required to pay Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

53. Labor Code Section 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays.

Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (a) labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 204 (d) the requirements of this Section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Plaintiff and Class were also 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 Class period, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees at the regularly set pay days and paid late, failed to pay 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.

54. During the Class Period, Defendant was obligated to pay Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked. However, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked at the legally mandated wage rates, including regular wages and overtime wages. Plaintiff and Class Members received additional remuneration in the form of gift cards. However, Defendant has not compensated Plaintiff and Class Members at the proper overtime and sick pay rate. Defendant did not include the additional remuneration paid to Plaintiff and Class Members in the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating overtime rate of pay and sick pay. Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to perform work “off-the-clock”. During the statutory period Defendant’s policy and practice required Plaintiff and Class Members to enter the worksite and immediately don their uniforms, among other things, in a restroom before clocking in for work and doff their uniforms after clocking out for their shifts. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for donning and doffing time. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and Class Members to arrive early to stay in line with other employees to clock in to work by

1 recording their time on a paper timesheet but did not compensate for that time. Additionally,
2 Plaintiff's and Class Members' supervisors would enter employees' time into a spreadsheet on
3 the computer based on the time recorded on the handwritten timesheets. However, often time
4 Defendant's supervisors would input on the computer less time than Plaintiff and Class Members
5 recorded on their timesheets. Plaintiff complained about the missing hours to her supervisor.
6 Defendant further failed to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for off-the-clock work such
7 as answering work related calls and text messages regarding their schedule and work assignments
8 on their personal phones outside of their shift hours. In maintaining a practice of not paying all
9 wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and Class
10 Members worked. In doing so, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours
11 Plaintiff and Class Members worked.

12 55. Plaintiff and Class Members were required to work overtime in excess of eight (8)
13 hours per workday and in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek but were not paid at the proper
14 overtime rate of pay.

15 56. Defendant's pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy
16 regarding illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an
17 entitlement, pursuant to Labor Code Section 218, to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the
18 Class, in a civil action, of the unpaid balance of the full amount of wages owing, calculated at the
19 appropriate rate.

20 57. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194.2(a) (which provides that in any action under
21 Labor Code § 1194, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages), the members
22 of Class seek recovery of liquidated damages on the straight-time portion of uncompensated hours
23 of work (not including the overtime portion thereof) in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
24 unpaid and interest thereon.

25 58. That calculation of individual damages for Class Members may at some point be
26 required does not foreclose the possibility of taking common evidence on questions regarding
27 their entitlement to overtime compensation. *Collins v. Rocha* (1972) 7 Cal.3d 232; *Hypolite v.*
28

1 *Carleson* (1975) 52 Cal.App.3d 566; *Employment Development Dept. v. Superior Court* (1981)
2 30 Cal.3d 256).

3 59. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 218.6 and 1194(a) and Civil Code Section 3287,
4 Class Members seek recovery of pre-judgment interest on all amounts recovered herein.

5 60. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 218.5 and/or 1194, Class Members request that
6 the Court award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred by them in this action.

7 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof**

9 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

10 61. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding
11 paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

12 62. Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512 provide that no employer shall employ any
13 person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without providing a meal period of not less
14 than thirty (30) minutes within the fifth (5th) hour of work, or employ any person for a work
15 period of more than ten (10) hours without a second (2nd) meal period of not less than thirty (30)
16 minutes.

17 63. Labor Code Section 226.7 provides that if an employer fails to provide an
18 employee a meal period in accordance with this Section, the employer shall pay the employee one
19 (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal
20 period is not provided in accordance with this Section.

21 64. Defendant failed to schedule Plaintiff and Class Members in a manner as to
22 reasonably ensure that Plaintiff and Class Members could take such meal periods within the
23 statutory timeframe. As a result, Plaintiff and Class were often forced to forego their meal
24 periods, work during their meal periods and/or take meal periods after the fifth (5th) hour of their
25 shifts. In so doing, Defendant has intentionally and improperly denied meal periods to Plaintiff
26 and Class Members in violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512, and other regulations and
27 statutes.

65. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and Class have worked more than five (5) hours in a workday.

66. By virtue of Defendant's failure to schedule Plaintiff and Class Members in such a way as to provide a timely and/or work free meal period to Plaintiff and Class Members, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in an amount which is presently unknown, but which exceed the jurisdictional limits of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

67. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of Class Members, requests recovery of meal period compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7 for the four (4) years prior to filing this complaint, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendant in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Rest Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof

(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)

68. Plaintiff and Class Members re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

69. The IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code Section 226.7 provides that employers must authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods at the rate of ten (10) minutes rest time per four (4) work hours or major fraction thereof.

70. Labor Code Section 226.7, subdivision (b) provides that if an employer fails to provide an employee rest period in accordance with this Section, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

71. Defendant failed and/or refused to implement a policy by which Plaintiff and Class Members could receive rest periods and/or work free rest periods. By and through its actions, Defendant intentionally and improperly denied rest periods to Plaintiff and Class Members in violation of Labor Code Sections 226.7 and 512.

1 72. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and Class have worked more than four (4)
2 hours in a workday.

3 73. By virtue of the Defendant's unlawful failure to provide rest periods to Plaintiff
4 and Class Members, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered, and will continue to suffer,
5 damages, in amounts which are presently unknown, but which exceed the jurisdictional limits of
6 this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

7 74. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of employees similarly situated, requests
8 recovery of rest period compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.7 for the four (4) years
9 prior to filing this Complaint, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against
10 Defendant, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or any other statute.

11 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Failure to Keep Accurate Records and to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**
13 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

14 75. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs
15 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

16 76. Labor Code Section 1174, subdivision (d) requires an employer to keep at a central
17 location in California, or at the plant or establishment at which the employee is employed, payroll
18 records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, each employee.

19 77. Labor Code Section 226, subdivision (a) requires an employer to provide
20 employees—either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's
21 wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal check or cash—an accurate itemized wage
22 statement in writing showing

23 (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee . . . , (4) all
24 deductions . . . , (5) net wages, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which
25 the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four
26 digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification
27 number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the
28 legal entity that is the employer . . . , and (9) all applicable hourly rates in

1 effect during the pay period and corresponding number of hours worked at
2 each hourly rate by the employee

3 78. Moreover, the IWC Wage Orders require that every employer shall keep accurate
4 information with respect to each employee, including time records showing when each employee
5 begins and ends each work period, when each employee takes a meal period, the total daily hours
6 worked by each employee and the total hours worked in each payroll period, and applicable rates
7 of pay.

8 79. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant willfully and intentionally failed
9 to make and/or keep records which accurately reflect the hours worked by Plaintiff and Class.
10 Specifically, Plaintiff believes that Defendant's records do not accurately reflect when Plaintiff
11 and Class worked during their meal and rest periods and/or took untimely meal periods or worked
12 for hours not paid.

13 80. Labor Code Section 226, subdivision (e) provides that if an employer knowingly
14 and intentionally fails to provide a statement itemizing, inter alia, the gross and net wages earned,
15 the total hours worked by the employee, causing the employee injury, then the employee is
16 entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial
17 violation and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each subsequent violation, up to four thousand
18 dollars (\$4,000.00). Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant willfully failed to make or
19 keep accurate records for Plaintiff and Class.

20 81. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant's failure to keep accurate payroll
21 records, as described above, violated Labor Code Section 1174, subdivision (d) and Section 226,
22 subdivision (a), and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s). Pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699,
23 subdivision (f)(2), Plaintiff and Class are entitled to penalties of \$100.00 and for the initial
24 violation and \$200.00 for each subsequent violation for every pay period during which these
25 records and information were not kept by Defendant.

26 82. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant's failure to keep and maintain
27 accurate records and information, as described above, was willful, and Plaintiff and Class are
28 entitled to statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 1174.5.

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure to Pay Wages upon Termination of Employment**

3 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

4 83. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs
5 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

6 84. Plaintiff and certain Class Members who ended their employment with Defendant
7 during the Class Period, were entitled to be promptly paid for all hours worked, including lawful
8 regular time compensation, overtime compensation, double-time compensation, and other
9 premiums, as required by Labor Code Sections 201 through 203. They are also entitled to meal
10 period and rest period premium pay in accordance with Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.7.

11 85. Plaintiff and Class Members were not compensated for their unlawful and/or
12 missed meal periods and/or rest periods, and were not paid proper regular time compensation,
13 overtime compensation or double-time compensation in accordance with law as a result of
14 Defendant's illegal practice and other violations.

15 86. To date, Class Members who ended their employment with Defendant during the
16 Class Period have not been compensated for all hours worked.

17 87. Plaintiff and Class Members seek the payment of penalties pursuant to Labor Code
18 Section 203, according to proof.

19 88. Plaintiff is also entitled to attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to Labor Code
20 Section 1194, and prejudgment interest.

21 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures**

23 **(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

24 89. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all the above paragraphs
25 of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

26 90. California Labor Code §2802, states "An employer shall indemnify his or her
27 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence
28 of the discharge of his or her duties."

91. Plaintiff and Class incurred expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Class for these employment-related expenses.

92. Defendant knowingly, willingly and intentionally attempted to offset the cost of doing business on the Plaintiff and Class.

93. Defendant had a corporate practice and policy of requiring Plaintiff and Class to shoulder the burden of Defendant's cost of doing business by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class for necessary expenditures.

94. Accordingly, Plaintiff and Class are entitled to an award of “necessary expenditures or losses” shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorney’s fees and interest.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Unfair Business Practices

(Against Defendant, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)

95. Plaintiff and Class re-allege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

96. Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. (also referred to herein as the “Unfair Business Practices Act” or “Unfair Competition Law”) prohibits unfair competition in the form of any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.

97. Business and Professions Code Section 17204 allows “a person who has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of the unfair competition” to prosecute a civil action for violation of the Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”).

98. Labor Code Section 90.5, subdivision (a) states that it is the public policy of California to vigorously enforce minimum labor standards in order to ensure employees are not required to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect employers who comply with the law from those who attempt to gain competitive advantage at the expense of their workers by failing to comply with minimum labor standards.

1 99. Beginning at an exact date unknown to Plaintiff, but at least since the date four (4)
2 years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, Defendant has committed acts of unfair competition as
3 defined by the Unfair Business Practices Act, by engaging in the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent
4 business practices and acts described in this Complaint including but not limited to violations of
5 Labor Code Sections 201-204, 226, 226.7, 510, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, 2699(f)(2) as well as
6 other statutes.

7 100. The violations of these laws and regulations, as well as of the fundamental
8 California public policies protecting workers, serve as unlawful predicate acts and practices for
9 purposes of Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq.

10 101. The acts and practices described above constitute unfair, unlawful and fraudulent
11 business practices, and unfair competition, within the meaning of Business and Professions Code
12 Section 17200 et seq. Among other things, the acts and practices have forced Plaintiff and other
13 similarly situated employees to labor for many consecutive hours without receiving the meal and
14 rest periods and overtime compensation to which they are entitled by law, while enabling
15 Defendant to gain an unfair competitive advantage over law-abiding employers and competitors.

16 102. As a result of Defendant's acts, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered injury
17 in fact in being denied their statutorily entitled meal and rest periods and full compensation for
18 hours worked.

19 103. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts and practices, Plaintiff
20 and Class have suffered lost wages in an amount to be proven at trial.

21 104. Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that a court may make
22 such orders or judgments as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by any person
23 of any practice which constitutes unfair competition. Injunctive relief is necessary and
24 appropriate to prevent Defendant from repeating its unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts
25 and business practices alleged above.

26 105. Business and Professions Code Section 17203 provides that the Court may restore
27 to any person in interest any money or property that may have been acquired by means of such
28 unfair competition. Plaintiff and Class are entitled to restitution pursuant to Business and

1 Professions Code Section 17203 for all wages and payments unlawfully withheld from
2 employees, including the fair value of the meal and rest periods taken away from them during the
3 four-year period prior to the filing of this Complaint, as well as for all expenses or losses incurred
4 by Plaintiff and Class in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her
5 obedience to the directions of the employer.

6 106. Business and Professions Code Section 17202 provides, “Notwithstanding Section
7 3369 of the Civil Code, specific or preventative relief may be granted to enforce a penalty,
8 forfeiture, or penal law in a case of unfair competition.” Plaintiff and Class are entitled to enforce
9 all applicable penalty provisions of the Labor Code pursuant to Business and Professions Code
10 Section 17202.

11 107. Plaintiff’s success in this action will enforce important rights affecting public
12 interest, and in that regard, Plaintiff sues on behalf of the general public, as well as herself and
13 other similarly situated employees. Plaintiff and Class seek and are entitled to restitution, civil
14 penalties, declaratory and injunctive relief, and all other equitable remedies owing them.

15 108. Plaintiff herein takes upon himself enforcement of these laws and lawful claims.
16 There is a financial burden involved in pursuing this action. The action is seeking to vindicate a
17 public right, and it would be against the interests of justice to penalize Plaintiff by forcing her to
18 pay attorneys’ fees from the recovery in this action. Attorneys’ fees are appropriate pursuant to
19 Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 and otherwise.

20 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **Violation of California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.***

22 **(Against Defendants, DOES 1 through 50, and each of them)**

23 109. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs herein,
24 as if fully alleged herein.

25 110. Plaintiff seeks recovery of penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorney
26 General Act of 2004 (“PAGA.”) (Labor Code sections 2698 *et seq.*)

27 111. PAGA permits an “aggrieved employee” to recover penalties on behalf of
28 himself/herself and other employees subject to violations of the Labor Code, including violations

of sections 201-204, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, and 2802, as well as the applicable Wage Order.

112. Plaintiff is informed and believes Defendants at all relevant times employed one or more employees.

113. For those code sections that provide for the recovery of civil penalties, Plaintiff will seek on behalf of all aggrieved employees those penalties. For those sections of the Labor Code that do not specifically provide for civil penalties, Plaintiff will seek civil penalties of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f).

114. Section 2699, subdivision (a) provides that civil penalties may be “recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees.” (Code Civ. Proc., § 2699, subd. (a).) Section 2699, subdivision (g), provides that an employee who prevails in a civil action under section 2699 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

115. The State of California, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees are, therefore, entitled to civil penalties, attorneys’ fees and costs, according to proof.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendant as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Causes of Action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

As to the First Cause of Action

4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all wages due;

5. For general unpaid wages and sick leave pay as may be appropriate;

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

7. For liquidated damages;

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

11. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;

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

13. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Third Cause of Action

15. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

16. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

1 17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the
2 date such amounts were due;

3 18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure §
4 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

5 19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
6 appropriate.

7 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

8 20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated the record
9 keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders,
10 and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

11 21. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

12 22. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this Section, pursuant to
13 California Labor Code § 226(h);

14 23. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

15 24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
16 appropriate.

17 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

18 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
19 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time
20 of termination of the employment;

21 26. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former
22 employees who have left Defendant's employ;

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

25 28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
26
27
28

1 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
2 appropriate.

3 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

4 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated Labor Code §
5 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

6 31. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
7 appropriate;

8 32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the
9 date such amounts were due;

10 33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

11 34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
12 appropriate.

13 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

14 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendant violated California
15 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked,
16 failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing
17 to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours
18 worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to
19 indemnify necessary business expenses;
20

21 36. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and
22 prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

23 37. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
24 funds disgorged from Defendant and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
25 Defendant as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et*
26 *seq.*;
27
28

1 38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
2 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

3 39. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this Section, pursuant to
4 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

5 40. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
6 appropriate.

7 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

8 41. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the
9 California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (, failing to provide
10 meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and
11 permit rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal
12 periods, failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay final wages at
13 termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

14 42. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, and all
15 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

16 43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
17 California Labor Code § 2699;

18 44. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and
19 appropriate.
20

21 As to all Causes of Action

22 45. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

23 Dated: May 29, 2024

TUNYAN LAW, APC

24 
25 _____

26 Lilit Tunyan
27 Artur Tunyan
28 Attorneys for Plaintiff NICOLE DEZA

1
2 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**
3
4

5 Plaintiff NICOLE DEZA hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.
6
7

8 Dated: May 29, 2024

TUNYAN LAW, PAC

9
10 
11

12 Lilit Tunyan
13 Artur Tunyan
14 Attorneys for Plaintiff NICOLE DEZA
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit “A”



535 N Brand Blvd. Suite 285
Glendale, CA 91203
Tel: (323) 410-5050
ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com

March 23, 2024

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
Return Receipt Requested

Michael Chalon
Agent for Service of Process for
Euro Snack, Inc.
3830 Dinah Road
Carmelien Bay, CA 96140

**NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE SECTION § 2698 ET SEQ.**

Re: Deza v. Euro Snack, Inc.

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that The Sentinel Firm, APC has been retained by Nicole Deza (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against her former employer Euro Snack, Inc. (“Defendant”). Pursuant to the joint prosecution and fee sharing agreement entered between Tunyan Law, APC and The Sentinel Firm, APC and Plaintiff’s written consent to joint prosecution and fee sharing agreement, Tunyan Law, APC and The Sentinel Firm, APC will be jointly prosecuting Plaintiff’s action against Defendant. The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which Plaintiff alleges 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 herself 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 Placer 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 cook and cleaner from August 8, 2022 to April 16, 2023. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Plaintiff typically worked 5 days per week and over 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 time period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. However, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the legally mandated wage rates, including regular wages and overtime wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees received additional remuneration in the form of gift cards. However, Defendant has not compensated Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees at the proper overtime and sick pay rate.

Defendant did not include the additional remuneration paid to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating overtime rate of pay and sick pay. Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work “off-the-clock”. During the statutory period Defendant’s policy and practice required Plaintiff and Class Members to enter the worksite and immediately don their uniforms, among other things, in a restroom before clocking in for work and doff their uniforms after clocking out for their shifts. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for donning and doffing time. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to arrive early to stay in line with other employees to clock in to work by recording their time on a paper timesheet but did not compensate for that time. Additionally, Plaintiff’s and the Aggrieved Employees’ supervisors would enter employees’ time into a spreadsheet on the computer based on the time recorded on the handwritten timesheets. However, often time Defendant’s supervisors would input on the computer less time than Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees recorded on their timesheets. Plaintiff complained about the missing hours to her supervisor. Defendant further failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for off-the-clock work such as answering work related calls and text messages regarding their schedule and work assignments on their personal phones outside of their shift hours. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked. In doing so, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

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. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had their meal

periods missed, late, interrupted, rounded, shortened, automatically deducted, on-duty, and/or restricted to the worksite due to Defendant's work demands, understaffing, policies, and practices. Further, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had to interrupt their first meal periods to unload products for Defendant from the truck during meal periods or take their meal periods at the end of their shifts instead of taking them before the end of the fifth hour of their work due to work demands. In addition, Defendant failed to provide second meal periods when the Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 10 hours in a workday. Defendant also failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with an additional hour of pay at their regular rate for every day in which they suffered a meal period violation. 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. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees regularly had their rest breaks missed, shortened, late, on-duty, restricted to the worksite, and/or interrupted. In addition, Defendant failed to provide third rest breaks when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 10 hours in a workday. 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 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 authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked

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 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 as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to purchase and maintain their uniforms out of their own pocket. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were reimbursed for the uniform only if they returned the uniform. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees would also use their personal cell phones to communicate with supervisors regarding their work assignments for the next day and their schedules and send photos of the completed assignments to supervisors but were not compensated for a reasonable portion of their personal cell phone bills. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

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 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 to Plaintiff and the 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, 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 list gross wages earned, 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 the 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, Defendants also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Lab. Code § 204(a). The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Lab. Code § 204(d).

Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were also 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 at the regularly set pay days and often times paid late, failed to pay all wages due, 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 §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;

7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
8. 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, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, 2699(f)(2).

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

The facts and claims contained herein are based on the information available at the time of this writing. Therefore, if through discovery and/or expert review, Plaintiff becomes aware of additional compensation owed or losses incurred by Plaintiff or by any other aggrieved employee of Defendant or any additional facts, Plaintiff expressly reserves the right to revise these facts and/or add any new claims by amending the claim letter or by adding applicable causes of action to the complaint which will relate back to the date of this letter.

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

Sincerely,



Lilit Tunyan, Esq.
TUNYAN LAW, APC

From: noreply@salesforce.com on behalf of [LWDA DO NOT REPLY](#)
To: ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com
Subject: Thank you for submission of your PAGA Case.
Date: Saturday, March 23, 2024 4:46:28 PM

3/23/2024

LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1018247-24
Law Firm : Tunyan Law, APC
Plaintiff Name : Nicoe Deza
Employer: Euro Snack, Inc.
Filing Fee : \$75.00
IFP Claimed : No

Item submitted: Initial PAGA Notice

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency. Please make a note of the LWDA Case No. above as you may need this number for future reference when filing any subsequent documents for this Case.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm

USPS TRACKING#



9590 9402 8114 2349 9460 07

 First-Class Mail
 Postage & Fees Paid
 USPS
 Permit No. G-10

 United States
 Postal Service

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box®

**TUNYAN LAW, APC**
 535 N. Brand Blvd. STE 285
 Glendale, CA 91203
**SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

 MICHAEL CHALON
 AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS
 EURO SNACK, INC.
 3830 DINAH ROAD
 CARNELIAN BAY, CA 96140


9590 9402 8114 2349 9460 07

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 0112 6463 77

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent☒ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

M. CHALON

C. Date of Delivery

3/29/24

 D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
 If YES, enter delivery address below: ☒ No

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

 Mail
 Restricted Delivery
 00)

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Michael Chalon
3830 Dinah Road, Suite 1150
Carnelian Bay, CA 96140

**Agent for Service of Process for
Defendant EURO SNACK, INC.**

Signature