

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413
Fax: (949) 656-7760
Email: aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs BRENDA BAKER on behalf of herself and
other aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BENITO**

BRENDA BAKER, an individual; on
behalf of herself and other aggrieved
employees,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SAS RETAIL SERVICES, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. CU-24-00152

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT ("PAGA") [California
Labor Code §§2698, et seq.]**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff BRENDA BAKER, on behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees
(hereinafter collectively "Plaintiffs"), and as private attorneys general, hereby assert
representative claims against Defendant SAS RETAIL SERVICES, LLC ("SAS"), and DOES 1
through 100 (hereinafter collectively "Defendants"), and hereby complain and allege as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This lawsuit is directed at Defendants' California state law violations of wage and
hour laws -- it is a representative action seeking recovery of civil penalties under the Private
Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), California Labor Code ("Labor Code") §§2698, et
seq. PAGA permits "aggrieved employees" to bring a lawsuit as a representative action on

1 behalf of themselves and other aggrieved current and former employees to recover civil penalties
2 for Defendants' violations of the Labor Code, including, but not limited to Labor Code §§201,
3 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1198.5, 2699, and all applicable
4 Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Orders.

5 2. This action is brought as a representative action on behalf of all current and
6 former aggrieved employees who were employed by Defendants in California and who work or
7 worked as non-exempt hourly employees during the applicable time period and who were subject
8 to Defendants' meal period policy, rest period policy, compensation policy, overtime policy,
9 final payment of wages policy, reimbursement policy, and related wage and hour policies and/or
10 practices.

11 3. As set forth in detail below, Defendants consistently implemented, maintained
12 and enforced unlawful policies and practices regarding Plaintiffs in violation of California's
13 wage and hour laws, which led to Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7,
14 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1198, 2698, et seq., 2802 and IWC Wage Orders to Defendants': (1)
15 failure to pay all wages, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime
16 compensation; (2) failure to provide meal periods; (3) failure to authorize and permit rest periods
17 or provide compensation in lieu thereof; (4) failure to timely pay all wages owed; (5) failure to
18 properly maintain and submit accurate itemized wage statements; (6) waiting time penalties; and
19 (7) failure to reimburse expenses. Such policies and practices, as further described herein,
20 violate the Labor Code, and trigger civil penalties under Labor Code §2699. Therefore,
21 Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all aggrieved employees, bring this representative PAGA
22 action pursuant to the provisions of the Labor Code as referenced herein. Plaintiffs seek
23 recovery of civil penalties, reasonable attorney's fees and costs, and other relief as deemed
24 proper.

25 4. The acts complained of herein occurred, occur and will occur, at least in part,
26 within the statute of limitations under the PAGA statute, or within the statute of limitations of
27 any other Complaint or other filing which has tolled the claims asserted herein, up to and through
28 the time of trial for this matter.

II. THE PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Baker is, and was at all relevant times mentioned herein, an individual residing within the State of California. Plaintiff Baker worked for Defendants as a non-exempt hourly retail merchandiser employee within California until July 2023.

6. Defendant SAS is and has been, at all relevant times herein, a Delaware limited liability company, and does business within the County of San Benito, in the State of California.

7. Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to Plaintiffs. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, Plaintiffs will amend their complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that each of the fictitiously named Defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged and that Plaintiffs' damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by those Defendants.

8. Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were the agents, servants and/or employees of some or all other Defendants, and vice-versa, and in doing the things alleged in this Complaint, Defendants are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were acting within the course and scope of that agency, servitude and/or employment.

9. Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were members of and/or engaged in a joint venture, partnership and common enterprise, and were acting within the course and scope of, and in pursuit of a joint venture, partnership and common enterprise.

10. Each reference in this complaint to "Defendant," "Defendants," or a specifically named Defendant refers also to all Defendants sued under fictitious names.

11. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege that at all relevant times herein, Defendants maintained offices, employed persons, conducted business in, and/or engaged in illegal employment practices and policies in the State of California, County of San Benito.

III. JURISDICTION

12. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction in this matter due to Defendants'

aforementioned violations of California statutory law and/or related common law principles.

13. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because both the relief sought herein exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established at trial, according to proof.

14. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because Defendants' corporate officers direct, control, and coordinate Defendants' activities from Defendants' offices located in the State of California.

15. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because during their employment with Defendants, Plaintiffs herein were all California citizens and Defendants have owned and operated offices within California. Further, there is no federal question at issue, as the issues herein are based solely on California statutes and law.

IV. VENUE

16. Venue in San Benito is proper in this matter as Defendants' liabilities and obligations arose in San Benito, including Defendants' statutory obligations to pay Plaintiffs wages for all hours worked, overtime wages, straight time wages, minimum wages, timely wages upon termination and/or resignation, provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, maintain and submit accurate wage statements, and other obligations as described herein.

V. COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

17. Defendant SAS customizes and delivers retail merchandising solutions to retailers throughout California. This case arises out of Defendants' failure to comply with California's wage and hour laws.

18. Plaintiffs and the aggrieved employees who Plaintiffs seek to represent worked for Defendants as non-exempt employees in California, during the relevant time period.

19. During Plaintiffs' employment, Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees the proper amount of straight time and overtime wages. Defendants have violated various sections of the Labor Code, including §§510 and 1194, by failing to provide Plaintiffs overtime compensation for work over 8 hours in a day and/or 40 hours in a week, because, among other things, Defendants fail to pay the proper regular rate of pay for all

overtime hours worked.

20. Defendants also fail to provide Plaintiffs with meal and rest periods under California law. Defendants failed to adopt, implement, and enforce a uniform meal period policy that complied with California law. For example, Defendants required Plaintiffs to take meal periods after they worked for more than five hours, and Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs with their full 30 minute duty-free meal period based on numerous factors, including but not limited to the fact that the amount of work required of Plaintiffs by Defendants necessitated that Plaintiffs take their meal periods late, return early from their meal periods, and/or interrupt their meal periods. Moreover, as a matter of policy and/or practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each workday that a 30 minute duty-free meal period was not provided. Defendants also failed to keep accurate records of meal breaks taken by Plaintiffs in violation of Labor Code §1174 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

21. Defendants also failed to adopt, implement, and enforce a uniform rest period policy that complied with California law. Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take duty free rest periods of 10 minutes for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof, by requiring Plaintiffs to regularly work through their rest periods to complete their duties, and failing and refusing to provide a rest period for any hours in excess of 10 per day. As a result of Defendants' lack of any meal or rest break policy that complies with California law, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§512 and 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, among other things.

22. Defendants also willfully failed to provide properly itemized wage statements to Plaintiffs pursuant to Labor Code §226. Defendants, for example, fail to identify the correct hours and rates of pay for hours worked for Defendants, including but not limited to violations of Labor Code § 226(a)(9) by not setting forth “all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.” Defendants also violate Labor Code §§ 226(a)(1) and 226(a)(5) by failing to correctly state the total net and gross wages earned by failing to itemize meal and rest period premium payments, among other things. The failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements violates Labor Code §§226, 2699, et

1 seq., and IWC Wage Orders.

2 23. Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely pay all compensation due and
3 owing to Plaintiffs whose employment was terminated during the relevant time period, by failing
4 to pay all of Plaintiff's compensation due upon termination by failing and refusing to pay
5 overtime and straight time wages, failing to pay Plaintiffs for time worked during meal and rest
6 periods, failing to pay Plaintiffs for an extra hour because Defendants failed to provide compliant
7 meal and rest periods and/or to pay for such meal and rest period premiums at the regular rate of
8 pay, and by Defendants' other unlawful actions as described herein. As such, Defendants are
9 liable for accrued wages due, and waiting time penalties owed, in accordance with Labor Code
10 §§201, 202, and 203.

11 24. Defendants also failed to reimburse Plaintiffs for all of their necessary and
12 reasonable expenses incurred on behalf of the Defendants. For example and without limitation,
13 Plaintiffs were required to, among other things, use their personal cell phones for business
14 purposes, purchase supplies to perform their jobs, use their personal vehicles for work travel, and
15 download CRM programs, but Defendants failed and refused to reimburse Plaintiffs for such
16 expenses.

17 **VI. PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM**

18 25. On or about April 17, 2024, Plaintiffs provided written notice via certified mail to
19 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendants of the specific
20 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
21 support the alleged violations.

22 26. The LWDA failed to respond to Plaintiffs' counsel's correspondence dated April
23 17, 2024 and failed to notify Plaintiffs' counsel as to whether it would investigate the allegations
24 contained therein, within 65 calendar days of the postmark date of Plaintiff' correspondence as
25 required under Labor Code §2699.3. Plaintiffs have fully complied with the notice requirements
26 set forth in Labor Code §2699.3 in order to commence a civil action against an employer
27 pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

28 27. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs for all hours worked, minimum wages,

overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to pay all wages upon termination or resignation, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, will subject Defendants to civil penalties pursuant to, without limitation, Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 256, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 1198, 2699, 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders.

28. Plaintiffs are aggrieved employees as defined in Labor Code §§2699(a) and (c), and related Labor Code provisions. Plaintiffs bring the causes of action below on behalf of themselves, as private attorneys general, and in a representative capacity on behalf of other aggrieved employees, affected by the labor law violations alleged herein.

A. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

29. Labor Code §1194 states that any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover 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.

30. Labor Code §1197 states that the minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

31. Labor Code §510(a) and IWC Wage Orders regulating payment of wages in the state of California, provide that eight (8) hours of labor constitutes a day's work and any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one (1) workday and any work in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for each employee and any work in excess of twelve (12) hours in any one workday shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for each employee.

32. At all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiffs to perform work without compensation in violation of the IWC Wage Orders and the Labor Code. Specifically, Plaintiffs were not paid for all of their hours worked, in that Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs for work performed by non-exempt hourly workers such as Plaintiffs for all of their hours worked by, among other things, failing to pay for work performed prior to their shifts and after clocking out,

1 and failing to pay Plaintiffs for all compensation owed at Plaintiffs' regular rate of pay.

2 Defendants are therefore in violation of Labor Code §§510 and 1194, and the IWC Wage Orders.

3 33. Pursuant to Labor Code §218.6 and Civil Code §3287, Plaintiffs seek recovery of
4 pre-judgment interest on all amounts recovered herein. Plaintiffs further request that this Court
5 award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action pursuant to Labor Code
6 §§1194(a) and/or 2699.

7 34. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
8 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
9 limited to Labor Code §§558, 1197.1, and 2699(f). Plaintiffs seek only to recover the civil
10 penalties provided for in §§558(a) and 1197.1 for the violations alleged herein, and do not seek
11 to recover underpaid wages.

12 **B. MEAL PERIODS (Labor Code §§226.7 and 512)**

13 35. Labor Code §512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders state that an employer may
14 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing
15 the employee a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, and an employer may not employ an
16 employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with
17 a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes. The applicable Wage Orders state that unless
18 the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be
19 considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. Labor Code §226.7(a) further
20 states that no employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period
21 mandated by an applicable order of the IWC. Moreover, an employer is prohibited from exerting
22 coercion against the taking of, creating incentives to forego, or otherwise encouraging the
23 skipping of legally protected breaks.

24 36. Plaintiffs were not provided with nor given the opportunity to take the requisite
25 meal periods before the end of the first 5 hours of work, nor were they provided with or given the
26 opportunity to take a proper second meal period during the days when they worked more than 10
27 hours in a day. Plaintiffs are entitled to an additional one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay
28 for each day in which they were not provided a proper meal period under the above-described

1 authorities.

2 37. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.7(b) and the IWC Wage Orders, if an employer fails
3 to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of IWC
4 Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular
5 rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided. As such, Plaintiffs
6 are entitled to an additional one hour's pay for each day in which Plaintiffs were not provided a
7 proper meal break under the above-described authorities.

8 38. Labor Code §558 and the IWC Wage Orders state, in pertinent part, that any
9 employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated,
10 a section of any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the IWC shall be
11 subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
12 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an
13 amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages; (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred
14 dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
15 underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. Plaintiffs seek only to
16 recover the civil penalty provided for in §558(a) for the violations alleged herein, and do not
17 seek to recover underpaid wages.

18 39. Plaintiffs request that the Court award interest on all unpaid wages at the legal
19 rate specified by Civil Code §3289(b), accruing from the date the wages were due and payable
20 pursuant to Labor Code §218.6.

21 40. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
22 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
23 limited to Labor Code §§558 and 2699(f).

24 **C. REST PERIODS (Labor Code §226.7)**

25 41. The IWC Wage Orders provide that every employer shall authorize and permit all
26 employees to take rest periods. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours
27 worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four hours of work, or major
28 fraction thereof. An employer must provide employees with 10 minutes rest for shifts from three

1 and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six hours up to 10 hours,
2 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on. Furthermore, Labor Code
3 §1198 provides, in pertinent part: . . . The employment of any employee for longer hours than
4 those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.”

5 42. Plaintiffs were not permitted to take proper rest periods and/or were required to
6 work during any “rest periods” in contravention of California law. Further, Plaintiffs and other
7 aggrieved employees were required to waive the taking of their rest breaks because of the
8 business of Defendants’ operations, and/or were coerced not to take legally mandated rest
9 periods by Defendants’ criticizing, disciplining and/or reprimanding Plaintiffs and other
10 aggrieved employees who attempted to take legally required rest periods; failed to schedule rest
11 periods; and pressured Plaintiffs to remain available during the workday.

12 43. Defendants further failed to pay Plaintiffs a missed rest period premium payment
13 for each rest period that was not authorized or permitted, and/or failed to pay such rest period
14 premium at Plaintiffs’ regular rate of pay.

15 44. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.7(b) and IWC Wage Orders, if an employer fails to
16 provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage
17 Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate
18 of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

19 45. As such, Plaintiffs are entitled to an additional one hour of pay at their regular rate
20 of pay for each day in which they were not provided a proper rest period under the above-
21 described authorities.

22 46. Plaintiffs request that the Court award interest on all unpaid wages at the legal
23 rate specified by Civil Code §3289(b), accruing from the date the wages were due and payable
24 pursuant to Labor Code §218.6.

25 47. Labor Code §558 and IWC Wage Orders state, in pertinent part, that any
26 employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated,
27 a section of any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the IWC shall be
28 subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each

1 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an
2 amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages; (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred
3 dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
4 underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. Pursuant to Labor
5 Code §§558, 1198 and 2699, and/or IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs are entitled to civil penalties
6 for each pay period in which Defendants underpaid their wages as set forth herein. Plaintiffs
7 seek only to recover the civil penalty provided for in §558(a) for the violations alleged herein,
8 and do not seek to recover underpaid wages.

9 48. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
10 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
11 limited to Labor Code §§558, 2699(f), and applicable IWC Wage Orders.

12 **F. FAILURE TO PROPERLY MAINTAIN AND SUBMIT ACCURATE**
13 **ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS (Labor Code §226)**

14 49. Labor Code §§226, 1174, and/or the applicable IWC Wage Orders require
15 employers to maintain and provide employees accurate time and employment records, as well as
16 itemized wage statements showing, among other things, gross wages earned, the total hours
17 worked by the employee, all deductions, net wages earned, all applicable hourly rates in effect
18 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
19 employee. Furthermore, the applicable Wage Orders and Labor Code §226 requires every
20 employer to keep accurate information with respect to each employee, including: (1) the
21 employee's full name, home address, occupation, social security number, employee's date of
22 birth, and time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period; (2) an
23 employee's meal periods; (3) total wages paid each payroll period; and (4) total hours worked
24 during the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

25 50. Defendants failed to properly maintain itemized wage statements in that, among
26 other things, the wage statements provided do not set forth the accurate number of hours worked,
27 correct rates of pay, all overtime compensation, meal periods, premium pay, and other related
28 information required by California law. In addition, in implementing their illegal policies and

practices regarding Plaintiffs, Defendants failed to record wages for rest period and meal period premiums and other wages that should have been paid to Plaintiffs as required by California law. Defendants have failed to record all items delineated in Labor Code §226 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and required under Labor Code §1174. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that these failures were knowing and intentional by Defendants as Defendants sought to deprive Plaintiffs of their legitimate right to unpaid wages, and otherwise deprive them of their proper compensation. As a result of Defendants' intentional and knowing failure to maintain adequate itemized statements, Plaintiffs could not ascertain the actual amount of compensation they earned and/or were entitled to, and thereby are presumed to have suffered cognizable injury in the form of the accrual of unpaid wages, overtime, and interest pursuant to Labor Code §226(e)(2).

51. Pursuant to Labor Code §226(e), an employee who suffers injury as a result of an employer's knowing and intentional failure to comply with subdivision (a), is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees.

52. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.3, "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation. . ."

53. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not limited to Labor Code §§226.3, 1174.5 and 2699(f), as well as reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

G. WAITING TIME PENALTIES (Labor Code §§201-203)

54. Labor Code §201 states that an employer is required to provide an employee who is terminated all unpaid wages immediately upon termination.

1 55. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants failed to
2 pay Plaintiffs all wages due and owing immediately upon termination, thereby violating Labor
3 Code §201.

4 56. Labor Code §202 states, in pertinent part, that an employer is required to provide
5 an employee who quits his or her employment all wages due and owing not later than 72 hours
6 thereafter.

7 57. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants failed to
8 pay Plaintiffs all wages due and owing upon voluntary resignation, thereby violating Labor Code
9 §202.

10 58. Labor Code §203 states that if an employer willfully fails to pay an employee
11 wages according to Labor Code §§201 and 202, these wages shall continue as a penalty for up to
12 a maximum of 30 days.

13 59. Defendants willfully withheld paying Plaintiffs wages thereby violating Labor
14 Code §203, as further set forth herein. As such, Defendants are required to pay Plaintiffs a 30-
15 day wage penalty in addition to all unpaid wages as described herein.

16 60. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
17 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
18 limited to Labor Code §§256 and 2699(f).

19 **H. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**

20 61. Labor Code § 2802(a) states, in pertinent part: “An employer shall indemnify his
21 or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
22 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
23 the employer. . .”

24 62. Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs for all of their necessary and reasonable
25 expenses incurred on behalf of the Defendants. For example and without limitation, Plaintiffs
26 were required to, among other things, use their personal cell phones for business purposes,
27 purchase supplies to perform their jobs, use their personal vehicles for work travel, and
28 download CRM programs, but Defendants failed and refused to reimburse Plaintiffs for such

1 expenses.

2 63. Defendants' failure to reimburse and/or indemnify Plaintiffs for these necessary
3 expenditures constitutes a violation of California law.

4 64. Pursuant to Labor Code §§2699, 2699.3, and/or 2699.5, Plaintiffs are aggrieved
5 employees, entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to the Labor Code, including but not
6 limited to Labor Code § 2699(f).

7 **H. ALL CLAIMS**

8 65. Pursuant to Labor Code §2699, Plaintiffs seek to recover civil penalties, as
9 otherwise provided by statute and wage order, for which Defendants are liable as a result of their
10 violations of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Order(s) in an amount to be proven at trial.
11 These penalties include, but are not limited to, those provided by Labor Code §§210, 225.5,
12 226.3, 256, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699. Plaintiffs further seek an award of reasonable
13 attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to the Labor Code §2699(g)(1) and any other applicable
14 statute.

15 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs pray:

16 a. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §2699(f), in addition to and entirely
17 independent and apart from other penalties in the Labor Code and for Labor Code
18 violations without a specific civil penalty, in the amount of \$100 for each
19 aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation, and \$200 for each
20 aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

21 b. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §558, as follows:

22 i. For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved underpaid
23 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid;

24 ii. For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
25 aggrieved underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
26 employee was underpaid;

27 c. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §1197.1, as follows:

28 i. For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred

dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid;

ii. For each subsequent violation for the same offense, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is intentionally committed;

d. For civil penalties per Labor Code §226.3 in the amount of \$250 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation, and \$1,000 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

e. For civil penalties per Labor Code §1174.5 in the amount of \$500 for each willful failure to maintain records as required by Labor Code §1174(c);

f. For civil penalties per Labor Code §256 in the amount of one day of pay, at the same rate, for each day that an aggrieved employee was paid late, at the time of termination, until payment was/is made, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days;

g. For civil penalties per Labor Code §210 in the amount of \$100 for each failure to pay each employee, and for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, \$200 for each failure to pay each employee;

h. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred; and

i. For such relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: June 25, 2024

BARTZ LAW GROUP APC

By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
AARON A. BARTZ
Attorneys for Plaintiffs BRENDA BAKER, on
behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand a jury trial on all issues triable to a jury.

Dated: June 25, 2024

BARTZ LAW GROUP APC

By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
AARON A. BARTZ
Attorneys for Attorneys for Plaintiffs BRENDA
BAKER, on behalf of herself and all other
aggrieved employees