

Roman Otkupman, CSBN 249423

Roman@OLFLA.com

Nidah Farishta, CSBN 312360

Nidah@OLFLA.com

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION

5743 Corsa Ave., Suite 123,

Westlake Village, CA 91362

Telephone: (818) 293-5623

Facsimile: (888) 850-1310

Attorney for Plaintiff,

Ariael Simpson, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the general public

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California

County of Sonoma

6/28/2024 9:49 PM

By: Ryan Carle, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SONOMA

ARIAEL SIMPSON, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the general public,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BURBANK HOUSING PROPERTY CORPORATION, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive.

CASE NO. 24CV03857

CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE § 226.7, 512 and 558);**
- 2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE § 226.7, 512 and 558);**
- 3. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2);**
- 4. KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS (LABOR CODE § 226(a), (e));**
- 5. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DUE AT TERMINATION (LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);**
- 6. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY EMPLOYEES IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 204(a)(b);**
- 7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR BUSINESS EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE § 2802);**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
8. **FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL HOURS WORKED, INCLUDING OVERTIME HOURS WORKED IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODE § 210, 218);**
9. **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200;**
10. **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE SECTION 2699(f) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 226(a),(e), 201-203, 204(a)(b), 2802, 210, 218**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF, Ariael Simpson (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and other “aggrieved employees” complains of Defendants as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Class and Representative Action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of Plaintiff and certain individuals who are employed by, or were formerly employed by, Burbank Housing Property Corporation and any subsidiaries or affiliated companies (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) within California.

2. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the present (the “liability period”). Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods and were also unable to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were forced to continue working through their meal and rest breaks in order to assist Defendant’s needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were unable to take their required meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendant failed to pay premium wages of one hour’s pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

///

1 3. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were required to work off the clock
2 for Defendant. On each day that Plaintiff worked, she was required to undergo security clearance
3 prior to clocking in. Additionally, Defendant routinely made Plaintiff and its California employees
4 undergo a COVID-19 screening process prior to the start of their scheduled shifts. When Plaintiff
5 would arrive, she was not allowed to clock-in for the day until she passed a medical examination to
6 screen Plaintiff for symptoms of COVID-19. The time spent between passing security clearance,
7 undergoing the COVID-19 screening itself, and completing the COVID-19 screening took Plaintiff
8 on the average of 2 minutes to complete. Moreover, Plaintiff and Defendant California employees
9 were asked to perform tasks prior to clocking in without being compensated for it. It took Plaintiff
10 on the average of 15-20 minutes to complete these tasks. Plaintiff and Defendant's California
11 employees were instructed to work approximately 15-20 minutes after they had clocked out to finish
12 their assignments such as walk the property. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's
13 California employees if these tasks were completed outside of her regular work hours. These excess
14 hours were not recorded on our client's and Defendant's California employees wage statements.
15 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees should have been compensated for that time, but she
16 was not in violation of Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1194.2. As a result, Plaintiff and
17 Defendant's California employees were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time
18 wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages constitute violations of Labor Code § 510
19 and 1194.

20 4. Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-
21 exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in
22 excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a
23 workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of
24 Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per
25 week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate.
26 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for
27 all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all
28 overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

 5. Additionally, Labor Code Section 1194(a) states: "[n]otwithstanding 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

1 balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest
2 thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees
3 claim that Defendant engaged in "time-shaving." This essentially means that the Defendant
4 underpaid Plaintiff by rounding the time Plaintiff worked in violation of Labor Code Section
5 1194(a).

6 6. Defendant failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately
7 itemized wage statements. As Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's California
8 employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all
9 gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of
10 Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable
11 hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of
12 Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. Since the
13 wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to accurately reflect the total number of Plaintiff's
14 worked hours, due to time-shaving. These violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3
15 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees.

16 7. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's
17 California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code §
18 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and
19 Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendant, have not accurately
20 reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest
21 premiums, and total hour worked.

22 8. Our client further alleges that Defendant paid her and Defendant's California
23 employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they
24 were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of
25 Defendant's failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they
26 were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates
27 Labor Code §§ 201-203.

28 9. Defendant pays Plaintiff and it's California employees on a bi-weekly basis and has
failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must
be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the

violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b).

10. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the equipment they purchased to perform work for Defendant such as supplies. Moreover, Defendant also failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the mileage they incurred performing certain tasks or running errands on behalf of Defendant. Defendant further failed to reimburse its California employees for using their personal cell phones for the benefit of Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties." As such, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

11. Defendant failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendant is liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure to pay wages as required by law.

12. Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees bring this claim pursuant to *Business & Professions Code* § 17200, et seq. The conduct of all Defendants as alleged above has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees.

13. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all proposed Plaintiff Class members (specifically, the "California Class" as defined herein), brings this action pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, Labor §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, Labor § 226(a)(e), Labor Code § 201-203, Labor Code § 204(a)(b), Labor Code § 2802, Labor Code § 210, 218, Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

14. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395. Defendants operate within the State of California. The unlawful acts alleged herein took place in Santa Rosa, California.

///

///

II. PARTIES

A. PLAINTIFF

15. Plaintiff Ariael Simpson is a resident of Broken Arrow, Oklahoma. At all times relevant herein, she was employed by Defendants in Sonoma County, California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt, hourly employee in California, including in and around the city of Santa Rosa, County of Sonoma. During Plaintiff's employment:

- A. Plaintiff did not receive final wages upon termination.
- B. Plaintiff and the Class were not paid in a timely manner pertaining to the waiting time penalties in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201-203.
- C. Plaintiff was forced to receive inaccurately itemized and deficient wage statements, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a).
- D. Plaintiff did not receive her compensation in accordance with Labor Code Section 204 in that Defendant failed to issues wages to its employees within seven (7) calendar days after the pay period ended.
- E. Plaintiff was required to work without meal and rest periods, nor compensation in lieu thereof, as required by the Labor Code and relevant Wage Orders.
- F. Plaintiff was required to work either in excess of eight hours per workday or in excess of forty hours per workweek without receiving compensation at a rate of one and one half the regular rate of pay.
- G. Defendant also failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job duties, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

B. DEFENDANTS

16. Defendant Burbank Housing Property Corporation is a California Corporation doing business in Santa Rosa, California. It operates within the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff and similarly situated employees within California. The violations alleged herein arose in Santa Rosa, California.

17. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a

DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

18. 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 Defendants, 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 Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants in all respects acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the proposed Class.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

19. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods and were also unable to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to continue working through their meal and rest breaks in order to assist Defendant's needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were unable to take their required meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendant failed to pay premium wages of one hour's pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

20. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were required to work off the clock for Defendant. On each day that Plaintiff worked, she was required to undergo security clearance prior to clocking in. Additionally, Defendant routinely made Plaintiff and its California employees undergo a COVID-19 screening process prior to the start of their scheduled shifts. When Plaintiff would arrive, she was not allowed to clock-in for the day until she passed a medical examination to screen Plaintiff for symptoms of COVID-19. The time spent between passing security clearance, undergoing the COVID-19 screening itself, and completing the COVID-19 screening took Plaintiff on the average of 2 minutes to complete. Moreover, Plaintiff and Defendant California employees were asked to perform tasks prior to clocking in without being compensated for it. It took Plaintiff on the average of 15-20 minutes to complete these tasks. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were instructed to work approximately 15-20 minutes after they had clocked out to finish their assignments such as walk the property. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees if these tasks were completed outside of her regular work hours. These excess

1 hours were not recorded on our client's and Defendant's California employees wage statements.
2 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees should have been compensated for that time, but she
3 was not in violation of Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1194.2. As a result, Plaintiff and
4 Defendant's California employees were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time
5 wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages constitute violations of Labor Code § 510
6 and 1194.

7 21. Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-
8 exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in
9 excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a
10 workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of
11 Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per
12 week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate.
13 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for
14 all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all
15 overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

16 22. Additionally, Labor Code Section 1194(a) states: "[n]otwithstanding any agreement
17 to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
18 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid
19 balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest
20 thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees
21 claim that Defendant engaged in "time-shaving." This essentially means that the Defendant
22 underpaid Plaintiff by rounding the time Plaintiff worked in violation of Labor Code Section
23 1194(a).

24 23. Defendant failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately
25 itemized wage statements. As Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's California
26 employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all
27 gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of
28 Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable
hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of
Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. Since the
wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to accurately reflect the total number of Plaintiff's

1 worked hours, due to time-shaving. These violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3
2 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees.

3 24. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's
4 California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code §
5 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and
6 Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendant, have not accurately
7 reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest
8 premiums, and total hour worked.

9 25. Our client further alleges that Defendant paid her and Defendant's California
10 employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they
11 were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of
12 Defendant's failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they
13 were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates
14 Labor Code §§ 201-203.

15 26. Defendant pays Plaintiff and it's California employees on a bi-weekly basis and has
16 failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must
17 be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the
18 violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of
19 their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b).

20 27. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the
21 equipment they purchased to perform work for Defendant such as supplies. Moreover, Defendant
22 also failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the mileage they incurred
23 performing certain tasks or running errands on behalf of Defendant. Defendant further failed to
24 reimburse its California employees for using their personal cell phones for the benefit of
25 Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her
26 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of
27 the discharge of his or her duties." As such, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees have
28 incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job duties, which were not
reimbursed by Defendant, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

///

///

1 28. Defendant failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California
2 employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these
3 practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked,
4 including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages
5 owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendant is liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure to
6 pay wages as required by law.

7 29. Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees bring this claim pursuant to *Business &*
8 *Professions Code* § 17200, et seq. The conduct of all Defendants as alleged above has been and
9 continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees.

10 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

11 30. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated as a
12 Class Action pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

13 31. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class composed of and defined as follows:

14 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

15 32. All current and former California employees of Defendants since the date
16 four (4) year prior to the filing of this complaint.

17 33. Plaintiff reserves the right under Rule 3.765, California Rules of Court, to
18 amend or modify the class description with greater specificity or further division into
19 subclasses or limitation to particular issues.

20 34. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class
21 action under the provisions of § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure because there is a
22 well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed Class is easily
23 ascertainable.

24 **A. NUMEROSITY**

25 35. The potential members of the proposed Class as defined are so numerous that joinder
26 of all the members of the proposed Class is impracticable. While the precise number of proposed
27 Plaintiff Class members has not been determined at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes that
28 Defendants currently employ, and during the relevant time periods employed, over seventy-five (75)
Class members in the State of California.

36. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant periods necessarily increases
this number substantially. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' employment records would provide

1 information as to the number and location of all proposed Plaintiff Class members. Joinder of all
2 members of the proposed Class is not practicable.

3 **B. COMMONALITY**

4 37. There are questions of law and fact common to the proposed Class that predominate
5 over any questions affecting only individual Class members. These common questions of law and
6 fact include, without limitation, whether Defendants failed to provide members of the Class with
7 wage statements that fully and accurately itemize the requirements set forth in Labor Code §226(a),
8 accurate final wages, and final wages on the day of termination and or within seventy-two (72) hours
9 of separation and whether the rest periods were timely made available.

10 **C. TYPICALITY**

11 38. The claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the proposed Class.
12 Plaintiff and all members of the proposed Class sustained injuries and damages arising out of and
13 caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of laws, regulations that have the
14 force and effect of law, and statutes as alleged herein.

15 **D. ADEQUACY OF REPRESENTATION**

16 39. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members
17 of the proposed Class. Counsel who represents Plaintiff is competent and experienced in litigating
18 large employment class actions.

19 **E. SUPERIORITY OF CLASS ACTION**

20 40. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient
21 adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all proposed Plaintiff Class members is not
22 practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the proposed Class predominate over any
23 questions affecting only individual members of the proposed Class. Each member of the proposed
24 Class has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendant's failure to comply with
25 Labor Code 226(a).

26 41. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their
27 claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.
28 Plaintiffs are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this
action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

///

///

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512 and 558)**

42. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 41 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

43. Plaintiff is entitled to one hour of pay for each day that Defendants failed to properly provide one or more meal periods as set forth in the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 558.

44. Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees were forced to continue working through their meal breaks in order to assist Defendants' needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees were unable to take their required meal breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages of one hour's pay for each missed meal break to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees who were denied timely meal breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

45. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 558 Plaintiff seeks the payment of all meal period compensations, which she was owed since she commenced to work for Defendant, according to proof.

46. Additionally, Plaintiff is entitled to, and seeks, attorney's fees and costs, and prejudgment interest.

47. Wherefore, Plaintiff seeks to represent request relief as described below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

**FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512 and 558)**

48. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 47 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

49. Plaintiff is entitled to one hour of pay for each day that Defendants failed to properly provide one or more rest periods as set forth in the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 558.

1 50. Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees were routinely unable, and not
2 authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and
3 Defendants' California employees were forced to continue working through their rest breaks in order
4 to assist Defendants' needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees were
5 unable to take their required rest breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages of one
6 hour's pay for each missed rest break to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees who were
7 denied timely rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-
2001, Section 12.

8 51. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 558 Plaintiff seeks the payment of all rest
9 period compensations, which she was owed since she commenced to work for Defendant, according
10 to proof.

11 52. Additionally, Plaintiff is entitled to, and seeks, attorney's fees and costs, and
12 prejudgment interest.

13 53. Wherefore, Plaintiff seeks to represent request relief as described below.

14 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
15 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES IN VIOLATION OF**
16 **(LABOR CODE §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2)**

17 54. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set
18 forth herein.

19 55. During the liability period, Defendant failed to pay all wages to Plaintiff and
20 Defendant's California employees.

21 56. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were required to work off the clock
22 for Defendant. On each day that Plaintiff worked, she was required to undergo security clearance
23 prior to clocking in. Additionally, Defendant routinely made Plaintiff and its California employees
24 undergo a COVID-19 screening process prior to the start of their scheduled shifts. When Plaintiff
25 would arrive, she was not allowed to clock-in for the day until she passed a medical examination to
26 screen Plaintiff for symptoms of COVID-19. The time spent between passing security clearance,
27 undergoing the COVID-19 screening itself, and completing the COVID-19 screening took Plaintiff
28 on the average of 2 minutes to complete. Moreover, Plaintiff and Defendant California employees
were asked to perform tasks prior to clocking in without being compensated for it. It took Plaintiff
on the average of 15-20 minutes to complete these tasks. Plaintiff and Defendant's California

1 employees were instructed to work approximately 15-20 minutes after they had clocked out to finish
2 their assignments such as walk the property. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's
3 California employees if these tasks were completed outside of her regular work hours. These excess
4 hours were not recorded on our client's and Defendant's California employees wage statements.
5 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees should have been compensated for that time, but she
6 was not in violation of Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1194.2. As a result, Plaintiff and
7 Defendant's California employees were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time
8 wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages constitute violations of Labor Code § 510
9 and 1194.

10 57. Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-
11 exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in
12 excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a
13 workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of
14 Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per
15 week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate.
16 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for
17 all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all
18 overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

19 58. Additionally, Labor Code Section 1194(a) states: "[n]otwithstanding any agreement
20 to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
21 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid
22 balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest
23 thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees
24 claim that Defendant engaged in "time-shaving." This essentially means that the Defendant
25 underpaid Plaintiff by rounding the time Plaintiff worked in violation of Labor Code Section
26 1194(a).

27 59. As a result, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were not paid for all
28 hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages
constitute violations of Labor Code § 510 and 1194.

60. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants in willfully failing to pay all alleges,
Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees have been deprived of wages in amounts to be

1 determined at trial, and are entitled to restitution and recovery of such amounts, plus interest thereon,
2 attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 1194 and liquidated damages pursuant to Labor
3 Code § 1194.2.

4 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED** 6 **EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS (LABOR CODE § 226(a),(e))**

7 61. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set
8 forth herein.

9 62. Section 226(a) of the California Labor Code requires Defendants to provide wage
10 statements to employees. In those wage statements, Defendants must accurately set forth, among
11 other things, the total gross and net wages earned, and all hourly rates in effect, for Plaintiff.
12 Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).

13 63. Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately
14 itemized wage statements. As Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendants' California
15 employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all
16 gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of
17 Labor Code § 226(a)(2), and net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all
18 applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in
19 violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due.
20 Since the wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to accurately reflect the total number of
21 Plaintiff's worked hours, due to time-shaving. These violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e)
22 and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees.

23 64. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and
24 Defendant's California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with
25 Labor Code § 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d). The statements provided to
26 Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not
27 accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and
28 meal/rest premiums, and total hour worked.

65. The wage statements provided to Plaintiff and members of the Class fail to accurately
itemize in wage statements total gross and net wages earned, and all hourly rates in effect for
Plaintiff. Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 226(a) are knowing and intentional, and Plaintiff

1 has suffered injury as a result of the receipt of defective wage statements, thereby entitling them to
2 penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e).

3 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES DUE AT THE TIME OF DISCHARGE IN VIOLATION**
5 **OF LABOR CODE §§ 201-202, RESULTING IN SECTION 203 WAGES AND**
6 **PENALTIES (WAITING TIME PENALTIES)**

7 66. Plaintiff hereby incorporates preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though
8 fully set forth herein.

9 67. At all times material herein, the California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, and
10 203 were in effect and binding on Defendant.

11 68. California Labor Code § 202 requires employers to pay employees all wages due
12 within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation. California Labor Code § 201 states in pertinent
13 part that “if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of
14 discharge are due and payable immediately.” California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an
15 employer willfully fails to timely pay such wages the employer must, as penalty, continue to
16 pay the subject employee’s wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is
17 commenced. The penalty cannot exceed 30 days of wages.

18 69. Plaintiff was entitled to compensation for unpaid wages, but to date has not
19 received such compensation. Specifically, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff all wages due to
20 Plaintiff at the time of her separation of employment from Defendant’s. Thus, since Defendant
21 failed to promptly pay Plaintiff all wages due to Plaintiff at the time of her separation of
22 employment, Defendant violated Section 201 of the Labor Code and Plaintiff is therefore
23 entitled to wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 203.

24 70. More than 30 days have passed since Plaintiff’s employment ended with
25 Defendant.

26 71. As a consequence of Defendant’s willful conduct in not paying wages owed to
27 Plaintiff, Plaintiff is entitled to 30 days of wages as a penalty pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for
28 Defendant’s failure to timely pay legal wages, together with attorney’s fees and cost of suit,
and interest pursuant to California Labor Code Section 218.5.

///
///

///

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY EMPLOYEES IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 204(a)(b)

72. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

73. At all times relevant herein, Labor Code § 204 was in full force and effect and binding on Defendants.

74. Wages must be paid according to a regularly set schedule. (Labor Code § 204). All earned wages must be paid at least twice a month, on days designated in advance by the employer. Work performed between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and 26th day of the same month. Work performed between the 16th and the last day of the month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. (Labor Code § 204). Weekly or bi-weekly (every two weeks) payroll must be paid within seven (7) days of the end of the pay period in which the wages were earned (Labor Code §§ 204(a), 204(b)).

75. Defendants pay Plaintiff and its California employees on a bi-weekly basis and have failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b).

76. Defendants have failed to comply with the above-section because they waited longer than seven days from the close of the pay period to pay its bi-weekly paid employees.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR BUSINESS EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2802**

77. Plaintiff hereby incorporates preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

78. Labor Code § 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties."

79. Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the equipment they purchased to perform work for Defendant such as supplies. Moreover, Defendant also failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the

1 mileage they incurred performing certain tasks or running errands on behalf of Defendant.
2 Defendant further failed to reimburse its California employees for using their personal cell
3 phones for the benefit of Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides that “[a]n employer
4 shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the
5 employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.” As such, Plaintiff and
6 Defendant’s California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the
7 course of their job duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant, in violation of Labor Code
§ 2802.

8 80. Plaintiff is entitled to reimbursement for these necessary expenditures, plus
9 interest and attorneys’ fees and cost, under Labor Code § 2802.

10 81. Plaintiff also requests relief as described below.

11 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL HOURS WORKED, INCLUDING OVERTIME HOURS 13 WORKED IN VIOLATION OF (LABOR CODES §§ 210, 218)**

14 82. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set
15 forth herein.

16 83. Section 2(K) or Wage Order 5 defines “hours worked” as “the rime during which an
17 employee is subject to the control of an employer, and including all the time the employee is
18 suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197
19 required employers to compensate Plaintiff for all hours worked at least at a minimum wage ad
20 established by the Wage Order. Defendants did not pay for all hours worked and frequently required
Plaintiff to work off the clock. Defendants have been engaged in many unlawful employment
practices which resulted in underpayment for hours worked each pay period as more set forth below:

21 84. Failure to Pay All Wages Owed Twice Per Month. Defendants were required to pay
22 Plaintiff all wages earned twice during each calendar month pursuant to Labor Code § 204(a).
23 Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff as a result of the unlawful employment policies
24 and practices herein. As a result of these practices, Plaintiff was underpaid for hours worked,
25 including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages
26 owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendants are liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure
to pay wages as required by law.

27 ///

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**UNFAIR COMPETITION PURSUANT TO
BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**

85. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

86. This is an Action for Unfair Business Practices. Plaintiff Ariael Simpson brings this claim pursuant to *Business & Professions Code* § 17200, et seq. The conduct of all Defendants as alleged in this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees as a result of Defendant's failure to comply with the labor code sections as set out above. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of *Code of Civil Procedure* § 1021.5.

87. Plaintiff is a "person" within the meaning of *Business & Professions Code* § 17204, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive relief, restitution, and other appropriate equitable relief.

88. *Business & Profession Code* § 17200 et. seq. prohibits unlawful and unfair business practices.

89. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct alleged in this Complaint, Defendants, and each of them, have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated specific provisions of the *Labor Code*, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business practices in violation of *Business & Professions Code* § 17200, et seq., depriving Plaintiff, of rights, benefits, and privileges guaranteed to Plaintiff under law.

90. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes unfair competition in violation of § 17200 et. seq. of the *Business & Professions Code*.

91. As a proximate result of the above mentioned acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has been damaged in a sum as may be proven.

92. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to engage in the unlawful conduct as alleged above. Pursuant to *Business & Professions Code*, this Court should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment, by Defendants, their agents, or Plaintiff, of any unlawful or deceptive practice prohibited by the *Business & Professions Code*, and/or, including but not limited to, disgorgement of profits which may be necessary to restore Plaintiff to the money Defendants have unlawfully failed

1 to pay.

2 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699(f) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR**
4 **CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 226(a), (e), 201-203, 204(a)(b), 2802, 210, 218**

5 93. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set
6 forth herein.

7 94. As a result of the acts alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code §
8 2698 *et seq.* because of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, 510, 1194, 1194.2,
9 226(a), (e), 201-203, 204(a)(b), 2802, 210, 218.

10 95. For each such violation, Plaintiff and all aggrieved employees are entitled to penalties
11 in an amount to be shown at the time of trial subject to the following formula:

- 12 a. With respect to the violation of Labor Code § 2699(f) for violations of
13 Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 226(a), (e), 201-203,
14 204(a)(b), 2802, 210, 218, \$100 for the initial violation per employee per
15 pay period and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay
16 period.

17 96. These penalties will be allocated 75% to the Labor Workforce Development Agency,
18 and 25% to the affected employees.

19 97. On April 23, 2024, Plaintiff sent a letter, by certified mail, return receipt requested, to
20 the LWDA and Defendants setting forth the facts and theories of the violations alleged against
21 Defendants, as prescribed by Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* (**Exhibit "A"**). Pursuant to Labor Code §
22 2699.3(a)(2)(A), no notice was received by Plaintiff from the LWDA within sixty-five (65) calendar
23 days of April 23, 2024. Plaintiff may therefore commence this action to seek penalties pursuant to
24 Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

25 98. Wherefore, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees he seeks to represent request relief
26 as described herein.

27 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

28 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

1. For a money judgment representing compensatory damages including lost
wages, earnings, retirement benefits and other employee benefits, and all other sums of money,
together with interest on these amounts, according to proof;

1 2. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 203 for
2 failure to timely pay wages due at termination.

3 3. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 226(e)
4 for failure to comply with itemized employee wage statement provisions.

5 4. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code §
6 1174(d) for failure to comply with itemized employee wage statement provisions.

7 5. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 1174.5
8 for failure to comply with itemized employee wage statement provisions.

9 6. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 226.7
10 for failure to provide meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof.

11 7. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 510 for
12 failure to pay all wages.

13 8. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 1194.2
14 for failure to pay all wages.

15 9. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 204(b)
16 for failure to timely pay employees.

17 10. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 2802
18 for failure to reimburse for business expenses.

19 11. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Labor Code § 210 for
20 failure to pay all hours worked, including overtime hours worked.

21 12. That Defendants are found to have violated the requirements of Business and
22 Professions Code § 17200 et seq.;

23 13. For penalties and other relief pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq. for Plaintiff and
24 all other aggrieved employees;

25 14. An award providing for payment of costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code §
26 2699(g)(1);

27 15. An award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

28 16. An award of prejudgment and post-judgment interest;

 17. An award providing for payment of costs of suit;

 18. An award of attorneys' fees; and

 19. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

1
2 Dated: June 28, 2024

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM,
A Law Corporation

3
4
5 By:



6 ROMAN OTKUPMAN
7 Attorneys for Plaintiff

8 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

9 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of her claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

10 Dated: June 28, 2024

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM,
A Law Corporation

11
12
13 By:



14 ROMAN OTKUPMAN
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT “A”

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION

5743 Corsa Ave, Suite 123
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Tel.: 818-293-5623
Fax: 888-850-1310

April 23, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Burbank Housing Property Corporation
1425 Corporate Center Parkway
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 471 4113

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Burbank Housing Management Corporation
1425 Corporate Center Parkway
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 4771 4120

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Agent for Service of Process
Lawrence Florin
1425 Corporate Center Parkway
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
Agent certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 4771 4137

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Burbank Housing Property Corporation
Burbank Housing Management Corporation
2239 Meda Ave
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 4771 4144

Re: ***Ariael Simpson v. Burbank Housing Property Corporation, Burbank Housing Management Corporation – Labor Code Violations of Burbank Housing Property Corporation, Burbank Housing Management Corporation – Compliance Letter of California Labor Code § 2698 – Private Attorneys General Act***

Dear Sir or Madam:

This office represents Ariael Simpson (“Plaintiff”), a former California employee of Burbank Housing Property Corporation (“Defendant”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Our client works for Defendant in Northern California. Herein we set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to our client and Defendant’s other California non-exempt employees.

Plaintiff began working for Defendant on or about May 13, 2019. While working for Defendant as a Senior Resident Manager, Plaintiff was earning (\$22.50) per hour.

Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods and were also unable to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were forced to continue working through their meal and rest breaks in order to assist Defendant’s needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were unable to take their required meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendant failed to pay premium wages of one hour’s pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were required to work off the clock for Defendant. On each day that Plaintiff worked, she was required to undergo security clearance prior to clocking in. Additionally, Defendant routinely made Plaintiff and its California employees undergo a COVID-19 screening process prior to the start of their scheduled shifts. When Plaintiff would arrive, she was not allowed to clock-in for the day until she passed a medical examination to screen Plaintiff for symptoms of COVID-19. The time spent between passing security clearance, undergoing the COVID-19 screening itself, and completing the COVID-19 screening took Plaintiff on the average of 2 minutes to complete. Moreover, Plaintiff and Defendant California employees were asked to perform tasks prior to clocking in without being compensated for it. It took Plaintiff on the average of 15-20 minutes to complete these tasks. Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were instructed to work approximately 15-20 minutes after they had clocked out to finish their assignments such as walk the property. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees if these tasks were completed outside of her regular work hours. These excess hours were not recorded on our client’s and Defendant’s California employees wage statements. Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees should have been compensated for that time, but she was not in violation of Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1194.2. As a result, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages constitute violations of Labor Code § 510 and 1194.

Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

Additionally, Labor Code Section 1194(a) states: "[n]otwithstanding 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. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees claim that Defendant engaged in "time-shaving." This essentially means that the Defendant underpaid Plaintiff by rounding the time Plaintiff worked in violation of Labor Code Section 1194(a).

Defendant failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately itemized wage statements. As Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. Since the wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to accurately reflect the total number of Plaintiff's worked hours, due to time-shaving. These violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees.

Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code § 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendant, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest premiums, and total hour worked.

Our client further alleges that Defendant paid her and Defendant's California employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of Defendant's failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-203.

Defendant pays Plaintiff and its California employees on a bi-weekly basis and has failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b).

Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the equipment they purchased to perform work for Defendant such as supplies. Moreover, Defendant also failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the mileage they incurred performing certain tasks or running errands on behalf of Defendant. Defendant further failed to reimburse its California employees for using their personal cell phones for the benefit of Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties." As such, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

Defendant failed to continue to take precautions to ensure employee safety after the onset of COVID. Under LC §6409.6(a)(1). "COVID-19" means severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, directly after the onset of COVID, were required to partake in mandatory temperature and health checks, but these activities were not enforced or practiced quickly after the onset of COVID and when COVID was still a health risk to the employees. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were also required to provide their own masks at the workplace. As a result of these practices, Defendant have violated Cal. Labor Code §§ 6400, 6401, 6402, 6403, 6404, and 6407 for failure to provide a safe and healthful environment for their Employees, as outlines above. Defendant are liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 2699 *et seq.*

Defendant failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendant is liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure to pay wages as required by law.

We invite Defendant or its attorney(s) to contact our office to discuss this matter, including whether an early resolution of the claims can be reached.

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Burbank Housing Property Corporation
Burbank Housing Management Corporation
April 23, 2024
Page 5

Our office awaits your response.

Very truly yours,

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Roman Otkupman', is written over a horizontal line.

ROMAN OTKUPMAN