

MAKAREM & ASSOCIATES APLC
Ronald W. Makarem, Esq. (SB#180442)
Daniel J. Bass, Esq. (SB#287466)
11601 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2440
Los Angeles, California 90025-1760
Phone: (310) 312-0299; Fax: (310) 312-0296

Attorneys for Plaintiff JOHN MCGREGOR
on behalf of the general public as private
attorney general

ELECTRONICALLY
FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

06/20/2024
Clerk of the Court
BY: AUSTIN LAM
Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

JOHN MCGREGOR on behalf of the general
public and all other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD OF CALIFORNIA,
INC., a California corporation; CUSHMAN &
WAKEFIELD U.S., INC., a Missouri corporation;
and DOES 1-20, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.

CGC-24-615682

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(LABOR CODE §§ 2698 *et seq.*)**

COMES NOW Plaintiff JOHN MCGREGOR (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and behalf of all others similarly situated, asserts claims against Defendants CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a California corporation, CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD U.S., INC., a Missouri corporation, and DOES 1-20, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”) as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a representative action for recovery of penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), Cal. Lab. Code sections 2698 *et seq.* PAGA permits “aggrieved employees” to bring a lawsuit as a representative action on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other current and former aggrieved employees, to recover civil penalties and address an employer’s violations of the California Labor Code.

2. In this case, Defendants violated various provisions of the California Labor Code. As set forth below, Defendants implemented policies and practices which led to unpaid wages resulting from Defendant’s: (a) failure to accurately pay overtime wages, (b) failure to pay minimum wages (c) failure to provide meal periods before the end of the fifth hour worked and failure to pay an additional hour’s of pay in lieu of providing a meal period before the end of the fifth hour worked; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest breaks for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked and failure to pay an additional hour’s of pay in lieu of providing a rest period; (e) failing to pay all wages earned and owed upon separation from Defendant’s employ; and (f) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (g) knowingly and intentionally failing to maintain accurate and complete records; (h) failure to indemnify for necessary business expenses; and (i) misclassification of employees as exempt. As a result, Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code sections 2698, *et. seq.* on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other aggrieved employees.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original

jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statutes under which this action is brought do not give jurisdiction to any other court.

4. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, each Defendant either has sufficient minimum contacts in California – Orange County, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California Courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

5. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 395. Defendants CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD OF CALIFORNIA, INC. and CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD U.S., INC. are operating and doing business in, California including the County of San Francisco, and each Defendant is within the jurisdiction of this Court for service of process purposes. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees within the State of California and within San Francisco and elsewhere in California.

6. On information and belief, Defendants have conducted business within the State of California during the purported liability period and continue to conduct business in the State of California, including in San Francisco. The unlawful acts alleged herein have had a direct effect on Plaintiff, and the similarly situated non-exempt aggrieved employees within San Francisco and the State of California.

7. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because on information and belief there are no federal questions at issue, as the issues herein are based solely on California statutes and law, including the California Labor Code, the IWC Wage Orders, the California Code of Civil Procedure, the California Civil Code, and the California Business and Professions Code.

8. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the present ("liability period"), Defendants consistently maintained and enforced against Defendants' Non-Exempt Employees ("Aggrieved Employees"), among others, the following unlawful practices and policies, in violation of California state wage and hour laws (a) failure to accurately pay overtime wages, (b) failure to pay minimum wages (c) failure to provide meal periods and

1 failure to pay an additional hour's of pay in lieu of providing a meal period; (d) failure to authorize
2 and permit rest breaks for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked and failure to pay an
3 additional hour's of pay in lieu of providing a rest period; (e) failing to pay all wages earned and
4 owed upon separation from Defendant's employ; (f) failing to provide accurate itemized wage
5 statements; (g) knowingly or intentionally failing to maintain accurate and complete records; and
6 (h) failure to indemnify for necessary business expenses; and (i) misclassification of employees as
7 exempt.

8 9. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the
9 present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to provide its Non-Exempt Employees
10 within the State of California, including Plaintiff, unfettered, uninterrupted, duty free rest periods
11 of at least (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof and failing to pay such
12 employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees regular rate of compensation for each workday
13 that the rest was untimely, interrupted and/or not provided, as required by California state wage
14 and hour laws.

15 10. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the
16 present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay overtime for hours worked in
17 excess of forty hours in a workweek or more than 8 hours in a workday.

18 11. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the
19 present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay minimum wages, overtime
20 wages, and wages earned on a regular pay period for all hours worked while subject to the control
21 of Defendants.

22 12. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the
23 present (rest and meal period liability period), Defendants have had a consistent policy of requiring
24 its Non-Exempt Employees within the State of California, including Plaintiff, to work at least five
25 (5) hours without a meal period and failing to pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at the
26 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period was untimely,
27 interrupted and/or not provided, as required by California state wage and hour laws.
28

13. On information and belief, as a result of these unlawful acts, Defendants failed to pay the required meal and rest period premiums.

14. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to timely pay wages upon separation.

15. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

16. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to indemnify work related expenses incurred.

17. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of knowingly and intentionally failing to maintain accurate and complete records.

18. Plaintiff, on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other aggrieved employees, bring this action pursuant to Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, for violations enumerated under 2699.5 as follows: sections 201-203, 204, 218, 218.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 515, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 2802, 2802(a) seeking penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs.

III. PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

19. Plaintiff JOHN MCGREGOR is a resident of California, who was employed by Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee who provided notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency within the last year preceding the filing of this action. Specifically, Plaintiff was employed as an associate at Cushman & Wakefield in California. Plaintiff's duties as an associate included valuing properties, managing property transactions, and developing business initiatives.

20. As Defendants' employee, Plaintiff, and all other aggrieved employees were regularly required to and subsequently suffered:

- (a) work in excess of eight (8) hours per day, and/or forty (40) hours per week; all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“IWC”);
- (b) perform work subject to the control of the employer without being compensated at least minimum wages, all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“IWC”);
- (c) work without being permitted or authorized a minimum ten-minute rest period for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked and not compensated one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided, all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“IWC”);
- (d) work in excess of five hours per day without being provided meal periods and not compensated one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided, all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“IWC”);
- (e) not paid all wages upon separation from Defendant’s employment (“IWC”);
- (f) not reimbursed for business related expenses, including unlawful deductions;
- (g) not provided accurate itemized wage statements; and
- (i) not properly classified as non-exempt employees.

23. Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code sections 2698, *et. seq.* on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other aggrieved employees.

B. Defendants

24. On information and belief, Defendants CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD OF CALIFORNIA, INC., CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD U.S., INC., and DOES 1-20, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”) operate in and are authorized to conduct business in the State of California. Defendants are commercial real estate companies operating throughout the United

1 States, including in San Francisco, and employ numerous non-exempt employees in the State of
2 California.

3 25. On information and belief, Defendants provide commercial real estate services
4 throughout the United States, including in San Francisco where Defendants maintain corporate
5 offices.

6 26. Other than identified herein, Plaintiff is unaware of the true names, capacities,
7 relationships and extent of participation in the conduct alleged herein, of the defendants sued as
8 DOES 1 through 20, but is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said defendants are
9 legally responsible for the wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these defendants by
10 such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint when their true names and capabilities
11 are ascertained.

12 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant, directly
13 or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and other members of the
14 Representative Group, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions.
15 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each defendant acted in all respects
16 pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business
17 plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable
18 to the other defendants.

19 IV. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

20 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants employ
21 or employed Non-Exempt Employees throughout California during the liability period. Plaintiff
22 and all other aggrieved employees have at all times pertinent hereto been non-exempt within the
23 meaning of the California Labor Code and the implementing rules and regulations of the IWC
24 California Wage Orders.

25 29. Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were compensated generally based on a
26 salary. Labor Code section 515(a) states that in order for a salaried employee to be exempt, the
27 employee must earn a monthly salary equivalent to no less than two times the state minimum wage
28 for full-time employment.

1 30. Plaintiff worked for Defendants from March 2022 to August 2023. In 2022, the
2 minimum annual salary to qualify an employee as exempt was \$62,400. In 2023, the minimum
3 annual salary exemption was \$64,480. In 2024, the minimum annual salary exemption was
4 \$66,560. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, he was salaried at \$50,000 per year.
5 Therefore, Plaintiff did not meet the threshold to be classified as an exempt employee based on his
6 salary.

7 31. On information and belief, and during the relevant time frame, all aggrieved
8 employees were residents of California and citizens of the United States.

9 32. On information and belief, Defendants operated as a commercial real estate
10 company throughout the country, including in San Francisco. Plaintiff was employed as a non-
11 exempt associate through Defendants' office in Irvine California.

12 33. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was not exempt
13 from the Employment Laws and Regulations, in that he routinely spent a majority of his working
14 hours performing duties delegated to non-exempt employees including, but not limited to valuing
15 properties, managing property transactions, and developing business initiatives.

16 34. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was either required to
17 work through mandatory meal and rest breaks or was often times interrupted during his meal and
18 rest breaks resulting in shortened meal and rest breaks. Additionally, Plaintiff was often not
19 provided with or allowed to take their mandatory meal break within the first five hours of work
20 because he was provided too much work to do and had no one to relieve him for such a break.
21 On information and belief, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were not paid for their
22 missed meal and/or rest breaks with one hour of premium pay at the regular rate of pay, despite
23 Defendants' pressuring of employees to work through breaks.

24 35. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was regularly required to
25 work over 8 hours in one day, and/or over 40 hours in one week. On information and belief,
26 Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were not paid for all overtime worked.
27
28

1 36. Upon information and belief, Defendants regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and other
2 non-exempt employees for all hours worked including minimum wage, overtime and double time
3 pay.

4 37. As a consequence, Plaintiff and other similarly situated non-exempt employees,
5 were not paid all wages upon termination and were not provided accurate wage statements.

6 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not
7 compensated for all hours/time worked, as Defendants would regularly suffer and permit Plaintiff
8 and Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock, but Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not
9 compensated for hours worked off the clock. For example, Defendants, among other things,
10 directed Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to continue to work in excess of 8 hours a day and/or
11 40 hours a week, such that employees overall lost hours worked. This practice resulted in Plaintiff
12 and Aggrieved Employees being subjected to Defendants' unlawful policy of not compensating
13 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked including overtime while under the
14 control of Defendants. Defendants' unlawful off-the-clock policy over time resulted in a large
15 and disproportionate underpayment of wages including overtime wages to Plaintiff and
16 Aggrieved Employees.

17 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were
18 caused to endure unprovided, untimely, interrupted meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for
19 many of the work days such employees worked more than six hours (6) hours, were not provided
20 uninterrupted second meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for any work days such
21 employees worked more than ten (10) hours, and were not paid one (1) hour of wages by
22 Defendants in lieu thereof, all in violation of the California Labor Code.

23 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were
24 regularly required to work in excess of six (6) hours per day without Defendants providing them a
25 timely, uninterrupted (30) minute meal period as mandated under the California Labor Code and
26 the implementing rules and regulations of the IWC California Wage Orders as Plaintiff and
27 Aggrieved Employees were required to take shortened meal periods because they were given too
28 much work to do without relief. Accordingly, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not

provided lawful meal periods and were not provided with one hour of wages in lieu thereof under Defendants' policies and practices, which included work schedules placed upon the Aggrieved Employees from Defendants' management and supervisors to perform work at the expense of their meal periods and Defendants' implementation of work schedules and workload requirements that denied Aggrieved Employees all of their authorized meal periods. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved employees did not waive any of their authorized and required meal periods, nor did they receive one hour of regular pay for each day Defendants failed to provide a lawful meal period.

41. Plaintiff is informed and believes that during the liability period, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to work in excess of four (4) hours (or major fraction thereof) without receiving lawful ten (10) minute rest periods. On information and belief, Defendants' management would require that Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees continue to work throughout their scheduled shift without relief, and as a result would often have to take their breaks late or be forced to skip their breaks. The Aggrieved Employees were also not provided with one hour of wages in lieu thereof. Defendants' policies and practices included Defendants' implementation of a work schedule and workload requirements that denied and failed to provide the Aggrieved Employees all of their authorized rest periods, including first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for every shift worked of at least three and a half (3 1/2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for every shift worked greater than six (6) hours.

42. Defendants did not fully compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for hourly wages during the liability period, including by virtue of the fact that Defendants did not compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with one extra hour of pay for Defendants' failure to provide such Non-Exempt Employees with each of their authorized rest periods and meal periods during the rest and meal period liability period.

43. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees as the wage statements provided failed to accurately account for all hours worked. Further, Defendants failed to provide accurate wage

1 statements as Defendants' wage statements do not identify premium pay or pay period start dates
2 as required by Labor Code § 226.

3 44. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to reimburse and/or indemnify
4 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all necessary expenditures incurred, including requiring
5 them to buy website domains for Defendants' benefit without providing reimbursement for
6 expenses incurred.

7 45. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to keep accurate records pursuant
8 to Labor Code § 1174.5.

9 46. Upon information and belief, Defendants knew and or should have known that it is
10 improper to implement policies and commit unlawful acts such as:

- 11 (a) requiring employees to work over eight (8) hours in a day and forty (40)
12 hours in a work week without being provided the required overtime pay;
- 13 (b) requiring employees to perform work subject to the control of the Defendant
14 without being compensated at least minimum wages;
- 15 (c) requiring employees to work four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof
16 without being provided a minimum ten (10) minute rest period and without
17 compensating the employees with one (1) hour of pay at the employees'
18 regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not
19 provided;
- 20 (d) requiring employees to work in excess of five (5) hours or ten (10) hours per
21 day without being provided an uninterrupted thirty-minute meal period
22 and/or a second meal period, and without compensating employees with one
23 (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that
24 such a meal period was not provided;
- 25 (e) requiring deductions for travel time, while under Defendants' control, daily
26 and without compensation;
- 27 (f) requiring employees to incur necessary business expenses without
28 indemnification and/or reimbursement;

- (g) failing to pay all wages earned during the regular pay period;
- (h) failing to pay all wages earned upon separation from Defendants' employ;
- and
- (i) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

47. In addition to the violations above, and on information and belief, Defendants knew they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for the allegations asserted herein, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, recklessly, and/or intentionally failed to do so.

V. REPRESENTATIVE CLAIMS

THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT – LABOR CODE §§ 2698 et seq.

48. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

49. On or about March 19, 2024, Plaintiff complied with notice requirements pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3. A copy of the notice was electronically submitted to the LWDA and a copy was also mailed via certified mail to Defendants indicating that they were on notice of the claims alleged here and that the notice requirement has been satisfied. Sixty-five days have passed and the LWDA has not indicated intent to investigate the claims and Defendants did not provide notice of an attempt to cure any of the alleged violations. Therefore, Plaintiff may proceed with this action in a representative capacity. The substance and violations set forth in this Complaint of which the LWDA was provided timely notice, Plaintiff has also sent a copy of this PAGA Representative Action Complaint to the LWDA.

50. Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee as defined in Labor Code Section 2699(a). Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf the general public and all non-exempt aggrieved employees, acting on behalf of the California Attorney General as private attorney general. Pursuant to *Balderas v. Fresh Start Harvesting, Inc.*, 101 Cal. App. 5th 533, 320 Cal. Rptr. 3d 326, 327 (2024), as modified (Apr. 18, 2024) Plaintiff does not bring an individual claim against his employer only a PAGA action for himself and other employees of the company. Plaintiff is not suing in his individual capacity but rather proceeding herein solely under the PAGA, on behalf of

1 the State of California for all aggrieved employees, including himself and other aggrieved
2 employees.

3 51. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a) Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties due
4 and owing for which Defendants are liable due to numerous Labor Code violations as set forth in
5 this Complaint, including without limitation, Labor Code section 201-203, 204, 218, 218.5, 218.6,
6 226, 266.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 515, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 2802, 2802(a) and
7 2698 *et seq.*, applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section
8 11000 *et. seq.*

9 52. At all times relevant, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees regularly
10 performed non-exempt work in excess of 50% of the time, and thus, were subject to the meal and
11 rest break requirements of the applicable IWC wage order and the Labor Code.

12 53. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510, 558, and 1194 by failing to
13 accurately pay overtime wages as discussed above due to Defendants' unlawful off the clock policy
14 and failure to pay all hours worked in excess of eight hours in a day and/or 40 hours in a
15 workweek. Therefore, Defendants violated sections 510, 558 and 1194 by not compensating its
16 Non- Exempt Employees for work performed in excess of eight hours (8) in a day or forty hours in
17 a work week (40). Section 510 of the Labor Code codifies the right to overtime compensation at
18 the rate of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8)
19 hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a work week.

20 54. Defendants also violated Labor Codes sections 200, 1194, and 1197 for failing to
21 pay minimum wages as described above. Labor Code §1197 provides that employees are to be
22 paid minimum wage for each hour worked and cannot be averaged and/or payment of a lesser wage
23 than the established is unlawful.

24 55. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 512 and 226.7 for failing to provide
25 timely, uninterrupted meal periods and requiring unlawful on duty meal periods, or compensation
26 in lieu thereof. Pursuant to Labor Code section 512, no employer shall employ an employee for a
27 work period of more than five (5) hours without providing a meal break of not less than thirty (30)
28 minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties.

1 56. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees
2 uninterrupted duty-free first meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes. Defendants
3 implemented and enforced policies and practices which required employees to work during their
4 meal periods, to forego their meal periods, and/or to return to work from meal periods prior to
5 thirty (30) uninterrupted minutes. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff
6 and all other Aggrieved Employees have been damaged in an amount according to proof at time of
7 trial.

8 57. Plaintiff, and on information and belief, all aggrieved employees, were
9 systematically not permitted or authorized to take one ten-minute rest period for every four hours
10 worked or major fraction thereof, which is a violation of the Labor Code and IWC wage order 5-
11 2001, section 12. On shifts where Plaintiff and aggrieved employees worked in excess of three and
12 a half hours, they were routinely not permitted or authorized to take lawful rest periods. Plaintiff,
13 and on information and belief, aggrieved employees, were not compensated with one hour of
14 wages for every day in which a rest period was missed, untimely or cut short as a result of
15 Defendants' policies, practices, or work demands. By failing to authorize and permit a ten-minute
16 rest period for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked per day, and by failing to provide
17 compensation for such unprovided rest periods as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the
18 provisions of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

19 58. Plaintiff, and on information and belief, aggrieved employees, were required to buy
20 website domains for Defendants' benefit without providing reimbursement for expenses for which
21 they were not reimbursed.

22 59. On information and belief, Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
23 statements pursuant to Labor Code section 226 which failed to include, all hours worked, including
24 off the clock, overtime and the accurate overtime rate, and the lawful meal and rest period
25 premiums earned, which are due and owing to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees. As a result,
26 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were harmed as they are unable to determine if they were
27 appropriately compensated for all hours worked.
28

60. On information and belief, Defendants failed to maintain accurate records as required by Labor Code section 1174.5.

61. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Aggrieved employees are entitled to penalties to the extent they were not paid at the prevailing wage rate for all hours worked.

62. Plaintiff and the Representative Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover Penalties and attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, as follows:

1. For penalties according to proof, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*;
2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and
3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

Dated: June 20, 2024

MAKAREM & ASSOCIATES, APLC

By: Daniel Bass
Daniel J. Bass
Attorneys for Plaintiff John McGregor