

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan (SBN 320389)
E-mail: lilit@moonlawgroup.com
Nichelle Christopherson (SBN 349221)
E-mail: nchristopherson@moonlawgroup.com
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff Brayden A. Carlon

FILED
KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
08/30/2024
BY Evans, Gricelda
DEPUTY

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

BRAYDEN A. CARLON, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JHAJ & BRAR, II, a California corporation;
JHAJ & BRAR, III, a California corporation;
JHAJ & BRAR, IV, a California corporation;
JHAJ & BRAR INVESTMENT, INC., a
California corporation; JHAJ & JHAJ, INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: BCV-24-101301

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226];
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.]; and
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff.....	3
B. Defendants.....	3
ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	4
CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS	8
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION.....	11
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION.....	13
THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	14
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	15
FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	16
SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	16
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	17
EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....	19
NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION	21
PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	24
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	28

1 Plaintiff Brayden A. Carlon to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for
2 further investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants Jhaj & Brar, II, Jhaj & Brar, III, Jhaj
5 & Brar, IV, Jhaj & Brar Investment, Inc., Jhaj & Jhaj, Inc., and Does 1 through 10 (collectively
6 referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and unfair business practices
7 stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages,
8 failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain
9 accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated
10 employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate
11 wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiff brings the First through Eighth Causes of Action individually and as a
13 class action on behalf of himself and certain current and former employees of Defendants
14 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully
15 below). The Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any
16 Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of
17 limitations period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

18 3. Plaintiff brings the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
19 California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
20 Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present employees of Defendants (hereinafter
21 referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

22 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
23 establishment within the State of California, including Kern County. As such, and based upon all
24 the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are
25 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
26 (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

27 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants
28 maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 1 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
2 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
3 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 4 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
5 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
6 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and
7 failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period
8 violation occurred;
- 9 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
10 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
11 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest
12 period violation occurred;
- 13 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 14 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
15 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within
16 the time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- 17 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked;
18 and
- 19 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
20 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
21 IWC Wage Orders.

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

26 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
27 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
28 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Class. Further, Defendants are

1 responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of
2 “respondeat superior”.

3 **THE PARTIES**

4 **A. Plaintiff**

5 8. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Kern,
6 State of California as a fast food worker from approximately August 2023 to April 2024.

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

10 **B. Defendants**

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

- 13 (a) California corporations with their principal places of business in Kern,
14 California.
- 15 (b) Business entities conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
16 State of California, including in Kern County;
- 17 (c) The former employers of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former employers
18 of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the
19 Class to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions;
20 and
- 21 (d) At all times mentioned herein, Defendants are and were the joint employers
22 of Plaintiff and the Class.

23 11. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
24 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,
25 and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Class in the State of California.

26 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times
27 each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and
28 the other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their

1 wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges
2 that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer,
3 director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest
4 and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some
5 or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to
6 some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters
7 alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted
8 pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or
9 should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and
10 abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

11 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

12 13. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of
13 Kern, State of California during the statutory period. During the statutory time period, Plaintiff
14 was a non-exempt employee, and was typically scheduled to work at least 5 days in a workweek,
15 and typically in excess of 8 hours in a single workday.

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

23 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
24 not paying Plaintiff and the Class for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Throughout
25 the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the
26 Class for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Defendants regularly use a system of
27 time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff
28 and the Class properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of

Defendants' operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Class were required to work "off the clock" and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Class were required to wait in line in order to clock into work, and when returning from meal periods, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Class were required to use their personal cellular telephones for work purposes while off the clock, such as to communicate through WhatsApp with other employees. Also, Plaintiff and the Class received non-discretionary bonuses and other remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, meal break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiff and the Class.

16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Class to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Class for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Defendants also failed to accurately record meal periods. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Class in compliance with California law.

17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Class to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Class for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or

1 authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Class, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or
2 practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or
3 practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Class were taking their required rest periods.
4 Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore
5 Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Class took rest periods during the middle of
6 each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit
7 Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

8 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the
9 Class to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants without
10 reimbursement, such as the use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes, and the
11 maintenance of uniforms.

12 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
13 pay Plaintiff and the Class at the conclusion of their employment all wages for all minimum
14 wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages. Further,
15 Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Class their final paychecks immediately upon
16 termination.

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

- 26 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
27 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
28

period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were entitled;

- (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;
- (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were;
- (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;
- (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages rates to which Plaintiff and the Class were entitled, and Plaintiff and the Class were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

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

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

21. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

22. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

23. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as a non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class is sent.

24. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

25. Plaintiff undertakes this concerted activity to improve the wages and working conditions of all Class Members.

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

(a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.

(b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

(c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated

herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

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

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

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

1 27. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if
2 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without
3 limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- 4 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum
5 wages, and overtime wages;
- 6 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to
7 Class Members;
- 8 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
9 wages to Class Members;
- 10 (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their
11 discharge or resignation;
- 12 (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked,
13 and all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
- 14 (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses;
15 and
- 16 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a
17 result of their illegal conduct as described above.

18 28. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
19 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

- 20 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
21 question affecting only individual members;
- 22 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
23 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 24 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
25 members of the class before the Court;
- 26 (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
27 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
28 class action;

- 1 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
2 equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate
3 compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are
4 responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members
5 of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- 6 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by
7 individual members of the class would create a risk of:
- 8 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
9 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
10 of conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 11 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
12 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other
13 members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially
14 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but
15 not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from
16 those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 17 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
18 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
19 the class as a whole.

20 29. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
21 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own
22 business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the
23 contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would
24 contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as
25 published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by
26 other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

27 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

28 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked)**

1 30. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
2 paragraphs 1 through 19 in this Complaint.

3 31. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of
4 an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or
5 not required to do so.

6 32. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to
7 Plaintiff and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay
8 compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the
9 provisions of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable Wage
10 Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

11 33. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages for all
12 non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

13 34. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiff and the Class have been
14 deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

15 35. By virtue of the Defendants’ unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to
16 Plaintiff and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiff and the Class
17 suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to
18 Plaintiff and the Class, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which
19 will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

20 36. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
21 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
22 compensation due Plaintiff and the Class.

23 37. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class are
24 entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants’ failure to pay minimum
25 wages.

26 38. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with
27 all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable
28 to this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates

1 required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times, Defendants
2 systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class all such wages due, and failed to
3 pay those wages twice a month.

4 39. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to seek recovery of all unpaid minimum
5 wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code §§
6 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

7 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

9 40. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
10 paragraphs 1 through 19 in this Complaint.

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

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

19 43. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight
20 hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

21 44. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class
22 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours
23 permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198. Plaintiff and the Class
24 are regularly required to work overtime hours.

25 45. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
26 compensation to the Plaintiff and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiff and the
27 Class have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently
28 unknown to them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be

ascertained according to proof at trial.

46. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to Plaintiff and the Class.

47. Plaintiff and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

48. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code § 204.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)

49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 19 in this Complaint.

50. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of Plaintiff and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

51. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact

1 that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),
2 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and
3 the applicable Wage Orders.

4 52. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
5 additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s),
6 plus interest thereon.

7 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

9 53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
10 paragraphs 1 through 19 in this Complaint.

11 54. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10
12 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than
13 two hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that
14 the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for
15 each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten
16 minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so
17 required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of
18 the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest
19 period mandated under any Wage Order.

20 55. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the
21 Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than 4 hours in a
22 workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as
23 alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take
24 these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of
25 the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

26 56. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
27 premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s),
28 plus interest thereon.

1
2
3 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)**

5 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
6 paragraphs 1 through 19 in this Complaint.

7 58. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by
8 failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiff and the Class for their necessary expenditures and
9 losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to
10 directions of Defendants.

11 59. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of the
12 expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

13 60. Plaintiff and the class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and
14 costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code section
15 2802(b).

16 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time**
18 **Penalties)**

19 61. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
20 paragraphs 1 through 19 in this Complaint.

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

27 63. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many
28 other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the

1 employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and
2 continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be
3 paid by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within
4 seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

5 64. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those Class members who are no longer
6 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within
7 seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor
8 Code §§ 201 and 202.

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

13 66. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally
14 accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days
15 maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

16 67. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiff and the
17 Class are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs
18 incurred in this action.

19 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and** 21 **Compliant Wage Records)**

22 68. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
23 paragraphs 1 through 19 in this Complaint.

24 69. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
25 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement
26 in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
27 worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate
28 if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made

1 on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages
2 earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the
3 employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee
4 identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
5 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
6 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

7 70. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
8 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the
9 failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiff and the Class, the failure to list
10 the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

11 71. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff
12 and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

13 72. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by
14 Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied
15 both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage
16 statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

17 73. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and
18 time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class were also injured as
19 a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following
20 Defendants’ refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California’s Labor Code and related
21 laws and regulations.

22 74. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual
23 damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

24 75. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of
25 attorney’s fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor
26 Code § 226(h).

1
2 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200,**
4 **et seq.)**

5 76. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein
6 paragraphs 1 through 19 in this Complaint.

7 77. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under California Business
8 & Professions Code § 17201.

9 78. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
10 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff
11 seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil
12 Procedure § 1021.5.

13 79. Defendants’ activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and
14 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions
15 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

16 80. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
17 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
18 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of
19 public policy; and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous,
20 and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of
21 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

22 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

23 81. Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the
24 California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California
25 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

26 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

27 82. Defendants’ failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation
28 of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity

1 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

2 **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked**

3 83. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance
4 with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or
5 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

6 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

7 84. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor
8 Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or
9 unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

10 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

11 85. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with
12 California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful
13 and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

14 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

15 86. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
16 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
17 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§
18 17200, *et seq.*

19 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

20 87. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance
21 with California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
22 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

23 88. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices
24 described herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from
25 Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly
26 situated, of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

27 89. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
28 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

1 90. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled
2 to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
3 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived, by
4 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and
5 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
6 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

7 91. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further
8 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
9 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,
10 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
11 practices in the future.

12 92. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no
13 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
14 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
15 practices. As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
16 above, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and
17 will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained
18 from continuing to engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

19 93. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
20 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
21 withholdings.

22 94. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff
23 and putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
24 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
25 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and
26 Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §
27 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

28 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

95. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 20 in this First Amended Complaint.

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

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

98. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. On April 14, 2024, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. At the time of this filing, 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

99. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by

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

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

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

27 102. In addition, Plaintiffs seek an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs
28 pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in

any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;

2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and

3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

As to the First Cause of Action

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

5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;

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

7. For liquidated damages;

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

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

As to the Second Cause of Action

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

11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

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

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

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

4 As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

13 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

22 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

23 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
24 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

25 26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
26 appropriate;

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

1 28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

3 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

4 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
5 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of
6 termination of the employment;

7 31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former
8 employees who have left Defendants' employ;

9 32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
10 due;

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

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

13 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

14 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record
15 keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and
16 willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

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

18 37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
19 Labor Code § 226(h);

20 38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

22 As to the Eighth Cause of Action

23 40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
24 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked
25 (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain
26 accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to
27 maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage
28 statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

1 41. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and
2 prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

3 42. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
4 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
5 Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

6 43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
7 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

8 44. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
9 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

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

11 As to the Ninth Cause of Action

12 46. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
13 Labor Code by failing to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide
14 meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate records of
15 hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, failure
16 to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish accurate wage statements;

17 47. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, and all
18 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

19 48. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
20 California Labor Code § 2699;

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

22 As to all Causes of Action

23 50. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 Dated: August 28, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

2 MOON LAW GROUP, PC

3
4 By: _____

Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Nichelle Christopherson

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff

7
8 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

9 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

10 Dated: August 28, 2024

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

11
12 By: _____

Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan
Nichelle Christopherson

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

3 I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not
4 a party to the within suit; my business address is 725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor, Los Angeles, CA
5 90017.

6 On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
7 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action by sending []
8 the original [or] [✓] a true copy thereof [✓] to interested parties as follows [or] [] as stated on the
9 attached service list:

10 Vanessa Franco Chavez
11 Anna M. Burnbaum
12 **KLEIN, DENATALE, GOLDNER, COOPER, ROSENLIB & KIMBALL, LLP**
13 10000 Stockdale Highway
14 Suite 200 Bakersfield, CA 93311
15 Telephone: 661-395-1000
16 Facsimile: 661-326-0418
17 vchavez@kleinlaw.com
18 aburnbaum@kleinlaw.com
19 vc_admin@KleinLaw.com

20 Attorneys for Defendants
21 JHAJ & BRAR, III, and JHAJ & BRAR, IV

22 [✓] **BY U.S. MAIL:** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The
23 envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am “readily familiar” with the
24 firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice
25 it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully
26 prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on
27 motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage
28 meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
true and correct. Executed this **August 28, 2024** at Los Angeles, California.

21 Karen Castillo
22 _____
23 Type or Print Name

21 
22 _____
23 Signature