

MESSRELIAN LAW INC.

Harout Messrelian, Esq. (272020)
500 N. Central Ave., Suite 840
Glendale, California 91203
Telephone: (818) 484-6531
Facsimile: (818) 956-1983

Attorneys for Plaintiff Kim Anderson

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

KIM ANDERSON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY HOUSING)
CORPORATION; ANITA U. NELSON;
and DOES 1 to 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **24STCV22438**

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR:

- 1) FAILURE TO COMPENSATE FOR ALL HOURS WORKED;**
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES;**
- 3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME;**
- 4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS;**
- 5) FAILURE TO PAY WAGES OWED EVERY PAY PERIOD;**
- 6) FAILURE TO PAY WAGES WHEN EMPLOYMENT ENDS;**
- 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS;**
- 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL BREAKS;**
- 9) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES;**
- 10) PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT ("PAGA")**
- 11) VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMES NOW Plaintiff, KIM ANDERSON (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), and alleges as follows:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, and VENUE

1. Jurisdiction and Venue are proper in this Court and this action is properly filed in the County of Los Angeles in this judicial district because Defendants SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY HOUSING CORPORATION; ANITA U. NELSON and DOES 1 to 25, inclusive (hereinafter collectively “SRO” or “Defendant(s)”) do business in the County of Los Angeles, and because Defendants’ obligations and liabilities arise therein, and because the work that was performed by Plaintiff in the County of Los Angeles is the subject of this action. Moreover, Plaintiff’s damages sought herein exceed \$35,000.

2. Plaintiff is a female resident of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

3. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all times herein mentioned, Defendant SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY HOUSING CORPORATION is a California corporation, doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and which employed Plaintiff.

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all times herein mentioned, Defendant ANITA U. NELSON is a female resident of the State of California, and the owner, managing agent, and/or director of SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY HOUSING CORPORATION, and is being included in this lawsuit pursuant to Labor Code Section 558.1 as she controlled the hours, wages, and/or working conditions of Plaintiff and other hourly, non-exempt employees. Moreover, ANITA U. NELSON was involved in the day-to-day operations of the business, including the wage and hour practices and policies. Defendants SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY HOUSING CORPORATION and ANITA U. NELSON are collectively

referred to herein as “Defendant(s)” (unless otherwise noted) or “SRO”.

5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or associate of those defendants fictitiously sued as DOES 1 to 25, inclusive, and so Plaintiff sues them by these fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the DOE defendants, numbers 1 to 25, reside in the State of California and are in some manner responsible for the conduct alleged herein. Upon discovering the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named defendants, Plaintiff will amend this complaint to show the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named defendants.

6. Unless otherwise alleged in this complaint, Plaintiff is informed, and on the basis of that information and belief, alleges that at all times herein mentioned, each of the remaining codefendants, in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course, scope, and under the authority of their agency, employment, or representative capacity, with the consent of his/her codefendants.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

7. Plaintiff started working at SRO on or around January 2024 as an intensive care manager. Plaintiff was and is classified as an hourly, non-exempt employee. Her employment at SRO was terminated on or around May 29, 2024.

8. In the case of Huff v. Securitas Sec. Servs. USA, Inc., 23 Cal. App. 5th 745 (2018), Plaintiff, Huff, was employed as a security guard for the Defendant Employer, Securitas Security Services USA, Inc., an onsite security provider. After about a year of employment, Huff resigned. Huff then filed suit against Securitas under PAGA. In his claim, Huff specifically alleged violations to the Labor Code requiring immediate payment of wages upon termination of employment and weekly payment of wages to temporary employees. The trial court determined Huff was not a temporary employee, and therefore, lacked standing to bring

1 the claim. Thus, Securitas was granted a motion for summary judgement. Later, the trial court
2 granted Huff a new trial. Securitas then appealed the grant of a new trial. On appeal, the issue
3 was whether Huff could bring a PAGA claim and sue for Labor Code violations that did not
4 directly affect him. Securitas unsuccessfully argued that the PAGA statute only allows the
5 PAGA representative to sue for violations that the representative has personally suffered. The
6 PAGA statute states that an “aggrieved employee” is able to file suit on behalf of themselves
7 and others. The statute also states that an “aggrieved employee” is “any person who was
8 employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged violations was
9 committed.” Because at least one of the violations that Huff had alleged had affected him
10 personally, the Court of Appeal denied Securitas’ motion.
11

12 9. In sum, since PAGA allows Plaintiffs to bring suit on behalf of both themselves and
13 other employees, it allows for suits broader than the specific violations the named
14 employee experienced. Therefore, even if the employee did not personally experience the
15 Labor Code violations, the employer may still be liable to under PAGA. Consequently, it is
16 Plaintiff’s position that Plaintiff can equivocally bring the following labor code violations on
17 behalf of all other employees, including ALL hourly, non-exempt employees, irrespective of
18 job title or job duties who worked for SRO at any of their locations in California during the
19 relevant PAGA period.
20

21 10. It is Plaintiff’s position that SRO has violated the following Labor Code Sections
22 against Plaintiff and other similarly situated aggrieved employees, who include all non-exempt,
23 hourly employees who worked for SRO at their various locations in the State of California
24 during the relevant PAGA period.
25

26 11. SRO violated Labor Code § 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1197.1 because it failed to pay
27
28

1 Plaintiff and other similarly situated aggrieved employees for all hours worked, including the
2 statutory minimum wage for all hours worked and for “off the clock” work. This is so because
3 SRO had a company policy wherein they would disproportionately round down the number of
4 hours worked, resulting in “time shaving” and further resulting in aggrieved employees not
5 being paid for all hours worked. In addition, and since meal periods were interrupted while “off
6 the clock” due to urgent emails or correspondence having to be sent or if a client came in, the
7 latter would amount to a minimum wage violation. Moreover, SRO failed to provide its
8 employees with proper and accurate reporting time pay.
9

10 12. Due to the above “off the clock” violations, SRO also violated Labor Code §510
11 because it failed to pay other Plaintiff and aggrieved employees overtime compensation, even
12 though they worked more than 8 hours per day, 12 hours per day, and/or 40 hours per week
13 throughout their employment. Plaintiff’s typical schedule was at least 8.5 hours per day with a
14 supposed meal period. As such, it follows that when Plaintiff’s and others’ meal periods were
15 interrupted due to work obligation, the latter would amount to not only a minimum wage
16 violation but also overtime compensation, which was not paid to Plaintiff and others. Plaintiff’s
17 and other aggrieved employees’ actual work hours entitled them to overtime compensation,
18 however, SRO did not compensate its hourly, non-exempt employees with overtime or the
19 correct amount of overtime due to the “off the clock” work and time shaving as described
20 above. Furthermore, SRO failed to include bonuses/incentive payments/sick pay in calculating
21 employees’ regular rate of pay for use in deciphering the correct overtime rate of pay.
22 Additionally, the incentive and bonus payments/sick pay were also not factored into
23 employees’ regular rate for purposes of receiving meal and rest break premiums per the Ferra
24 v. Loews case.
25
26

27 13. SRO also violated Labor Code § 226.7 and the appropriate Industrial Welfare
28

Commission Wage Order no. 4/5 because it failed to provide Plaintiff and other similarly situated aggrieved employees with 10-minute rest periods for every four hours of work, or majority portion thereof, throughout their employment. SRO did not completely relieve Plaintiff and others of all duty during said rest periods. SRO did not pay to Plaintiff and others one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's regular rate of compensation for each workday that one or more statutory rest periods was not provided. It was not part of the company policy for employees such as Plaintiff to consistently take at least two rest breaks per shift. The idea of rest breaks was not consistently implemented. The latter was due to being understaffed and not having enough personnel and having to consistently deal with client needs. The concept of timely, uninterrupted rest breaks was not implemented as it was not company policy. As such, the culture as well as the policies and procedures of SRO did not lend itself to the employees receiving consistent timely, statutory rest breaks wherein they were relieved of all work duties. The environment at SRO was not conducive to receiving multiple statutory rest breaks under California law and timely, statutory rest breaks were not authorized or enforced.

14. SRO violated Labor Code §§ 512 and 226.7 and the appropriate Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order no. 4/5 because it failed to provide hourly, non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and others, the requisite 30-minute, uninterrupted meal periods for every five (5) hours of work throughout their employment. SRO did not completely relieve Plaintiff and other employees of all duty during said meal periods. SRO did not pay to Plaintiff and its hourly, non-exempt employees one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that one or more statutory meal periods was not provided. The hourly, non-exempt employees were not always able to take meal periods before the 5th hour. Moreover, the meal periods would be interrupted by work obligations such as having to send emails or helping out clients if they came in to the location. Like the rest breaks, receiving a thirty-

1 minute timely meal break was not part of the company culture and was not enforced by SRO.
2 Consequently, it was the normal practice and custom of SRO not to authorize, permit, and
3 enforce timely statutory meal periods. If SRO had Plaintiff sign an on-duty meal period
4 agreement wherein Plaintiff agreed to work through the meal periods, it would be invalid and
5 unenforceable because the nature of Plaintiff's job does not and did not prevent her from taking
6 a meal period and the company could have hired "breakers" to relieve Plaintiff of her job
7 duties so that she can actually take a timely, uninterrupted meal period. Moreover, any such
8 "on duty" meal period agreement did not allow for Plaintiff to revoke such an agreement even
9 if it was signed. To the extent that SRO argues that Plaintiff and others were paid to work
10 through their meal period, this argument is not compelling due to the position that there was no
11 valid meal period waiver in place and even if there was, it is still a violation to prevent an
12 employee from taking a meal break in order to rest and recover. To the extent that SRO argues
13 that employees receive meal break premium pay for missed, late or short meal and rest periods,
14 that argument is inconsequential for PAGA penalty purposes since the PAGA penalties are for
15 the violations themselves, irrespective of whether an employee received the premium payment
16 for a missed, short, or interrupted meal period. In *Kirby v. Immoos Fire Protection, Inc.*, the
17 Court stated, "section 226.7 does not give employers a lawful choice between
18 providing *either* meal and rest breaks *or* an additional hour of pay." See *Kirby v. Immoos Fire*
19 *Protection, Inc.*, (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1244, 1256 (emphasis in original). Thus, the extra hour of
20 pay does not excuse the violation; the employer has still committed a violation even if the
21 remedy for the violation has been paid. See *Wert v. U.S. Bancorp*, (S.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2016,
22 2016 WL 1110302 at *4). As such, the work environment and culture at SRO was not
23 conducive to receiving consistent, timely, statutory meal breaks under California law.
24 Moreover, any meal or rest break premiums paid were not compensated at the weighted
25
26
27
28

1 average regular rate, inclusive of bonuses and/or incentive payments/sick pay as well as
2 overtime compensation.

3 15. Furthermore, during the relevant time period, and due to the above labor code
4 violations, SRO failed to pay Plaintiff and other similarly situated aggrieved employees all
5 wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.
6 SRO was also in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) by failing to include
7 pertinent information on the wage statements, including but not limited to, the correct hourly
8 rate, all hours worked, overtime hours worked, correct overtime pay, gross wages earned, net
9 wages earned, premium pay for missed meal and rest breaks, all deductions, the correct start
10 and end of the pay period, all employee identifying information, the correct and complete name
11 and address of the legal employer, and reimbursement for business expenses, among others. As
12 such, SRO did not provide Plaintiff and other similarly situated aggrieved employees with
13 complete, accurate itemized wage statements.
14

15 16. During the relevant time period, SRO also failed to keep accurate and complete payroll
16 records showing the actual hours worked per day and the wages paid to Plaintiff and others
17 pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1174(d).
18

19 17. SRO also violated Labor Code § 203 because it willfully failed to pay other similarly
20 situated aggrieved employees earned and due wages upon separation of employment, either
21 immediately upon involuntary termination, or within 72 hours of resignation. These earned but
22 unpaid wages include compensation for all hours worked, including minimum wages, overtime
23 compensation, and premium pay for missed meal and rest breaks.
24

25 18. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees incurred
26 necessary, business-related expenses and costs that were not reimbursed or adequately
27 reimbursed by SRO. These costs include, but are not limited to, use of personal cell phones for
28

1 work purposes and use of personal vehicles for work purposes. For instance, Plaintiff would
2 utilize her cell phone to call specific clients and had utilized her vehicle to drive to a different
3 facility to visit a client without getting reimbursed for mileage. Accordingly, SRO was in
4 violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

5 19. Furthermore, SRO did not provide proper and correct/accurate sick pay that was also
6 delineated on employee pay stubs and also failed to provide proper sick leave in violation of
7 Labor Code sections 233 and 246. Moreover, there were no suitable seating/rest break facilities
8 for the employees pursuant to Wage Order no. 4-2001/5-2001.

10 20. Furthermore, Plaintiff believes Defendants have also violated Labor Code Section 558
11 and have engaged in business practices which violate Business and Professions Code Section
12 17200.

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO COMPENSATE FOR ALL HOURS WORKED**

15 **(California Industrial Welfare Commission Order 4-2001/5-2001, California Code of**
16 **Regulations Title 8 Section 11040/11050, and California Labor Code Section 1198)**

17 **(Plaintiff against all named defendants and all DOE defendants)**

18 21. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
19 paragraphs 1 through 20, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

20 22. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate its employees for
21 all hours worked upon reporting for work at the appointed time stated by the employer
22 pursuant to Industrial Welfare Commission Order 4-2001/5-2001, California Code of
23 Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040/11050.

24 23. For the three (3) years preceding filing of this action, Defendants failed to compensate
25 Plaintiff for all hours worked.

1 24. Under the aforementioned wage order and regulations, Plaintiff is to recover
2 compensation for all hours worked but not paid by Defendants for the three (3) years
3 preceding the filing of this Complaint.

4 25. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff has been damaged in
5 an amount according to proof at time of trial, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of
6 this Court.

7 26. Defendants' conduct described herein violates Labor Code Section 512, 558, 1194, and
8 1198. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code Sections 218.5, 512, 558, and 1194, Plaintiff is
9 entitled to recover damages for the nonpayment of wages for all hours worked, penalties, plus
10 reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit.

11 27. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
12 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney's fees, and costs which will equal an
13 amount known to Plaintiff once she has obtained all of her payroll records from
14 Defendants.
15
16

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

19 **(California Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2, 1197)**

20 **(Plaintiff against all named defendants and all DOE defendants)**

21 28. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
22 paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

23 29. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2 and 1197, it is unlawful for an employer
24 to suffer or permit a California employee to work without paying wages at the minimum wage
25 rate for all hours worked as required by the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
26 (hereinafter "IWC") Wage Order No. 4-2001/5-2001, codified at California Code of
27
28

1 Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040/11050, subdivision 4.

2 30. Pursuant to IWC Wage Order no. 4-2001/5-2001, subdivision 2(K)/(H), at all relevant
3 times, “hours worked” included “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
5 or not required to do so...”

6 31. During her employment, Plaintiff was regularly required as a matter of uniform
7 policy and practice to work, and in fact worked, as an employee of Defendants and Plaintiff
8 was paid less than the minimum wage rate by Defendants for hours worked in violation of
9 California Labor Code Section 1197 and the applicable California Industrial Wage
10 Commission wage order(s).

11 32. Plaintiff was, at all relevant times, under the control of Defendants and suffered or
12 permitted to work by Defendants. Defendants’ acts or omissions in failing to adequately
13 compensate Plaintiff were not in good faith nor were there reasonable grounds for Defendants
14 to believe that their acts or omissions were not contrary to California law.

15 33. For all hours worked by Plaintiff for which she was paid less than the minimum wage
16 rate by Defendants, Plaintiff is entitled to not less than the applicable California minimum
17 wage rate and, pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194.2(a), liquidated damages in an amount
18 equal to unpaid minimum wages and interests thereon. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194,
19 Plaintiff is also entitled to attorney’s fees, costs and interests according to proof.

20 34. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
21 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney’s fees, and costs according to proof at
22 trial.

23
24
25
26 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME**

(California Industrial Welfare Commission Order 4-2001/5-2001, California Code of Regulations Title 8 Section 11040/11050; California Labor Code Section 510)

(Plaintiff against all named defendants and all DOE defendants)

35. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

36. Pursuant to Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4-2001/5-2001, Cal. Code of Regs., Title 8, Section 11040/11050, for the period of Plaintiff's employment, Defendants were required to compensate Plaintiff for all overtime, which is calculated at one and one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) in a day or forty (40) hours in a week, and two (2) times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or hours worked in excess of eight (8) on the seventh consecutive work day in a week.

37. Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee entitled to the protections of the California Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4-2001/5-2001, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040/11050.

38. Plaintiff worked more than eight (8) hours in a single workday, twelve (12) hours in a single workday or forty (40) hours in a single workweek on numerous occasions.

39. Plaintiff was entitled to the above overtime premiums.

40. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff premium wages of at least one and one-half times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for hours worked past eight (8) in a day. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff premium wages of at least twice Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for hours worked past twelve (12) in a day.

41. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff premium wages of at least one and one-half times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for hours worked past forty (40) in a week.

1 42. Plaintiff worked at least one pay period in which she was not properly paid overtime
2 within the three (3) years prior to the initiation of this lawsuit.

3 43. Defendants know or should know the actual dates of overtime worked, the amount of
4 overtime worked, and the amount of unpaid overtime due.

5 44. As a proximate result of Defendants' violations, Plaintiff has been damaged in an
6 amount according to proof at time of trial, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this
7 Court.

8 45. Pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 218.6, 510, 1194, and California Code of
9 Regulations, Title 8, Sections 11040/11050, Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages for the
10 nonpayment of overtime premiums for all overtime hours worked, penalties, interest, plus
11 reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit.
12

13 46. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
14 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney's fees, and costs according to proof at
15 trial.
16

17 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

19 **(California Labor Code Section 226)**

20 **(Plaintiff against all named defendants and all DOE defendants)**

21 47. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
22 paragraphs 1 through 46, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
23

24 48. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226, every employer must furnish each
25 employee an itemized statement of wages and deductions at the time of payment of wages.

26 49. Defendants knowingly and intentionally did not furnish Plaintiff with any pay stubs that
27 accurately reflected all information required by Labor Code Section 226, including but not
28

1 limited to, gross wages earned, including overtime, minimum wages, and premium pay for
2 missed meal and rest breaks, net wages earned, total hours worked by the employee, and all
3 deductions. Therefore, Defendants failed to maintain and provide accurate itemized wage
4 statements to Plaintiff in accordance with California Labor Code Section 226(a).

5 50. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(e), Plaintiff is entitled to recover the
6 greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation
7 occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay
8 period, not exceeding an aggregate amount of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), plus costs and
9 reasonable attorney's fees.
10

11 51. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has
12 sustained damages, including loss of earnings, in an amount to be established at trial. As a
13 further direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein,
14 Plaintiff is entitled to recover penalties, in an amount to be established at trial, as well as costs
15 and attorney's fees pursuant to statute.
16

17 52. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
18 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney's fees, and costs according to proof at
19 trial.

20 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES OWED EVERY PAY PERIOD**

22 **(California Labor Code Section 204)**

23 **(Plaintiff against all named defendants and all DOE defendants)**

24 53. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
25 paragraphs 1 through 52, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
26

27 54. California Labor Code Section 204 establishes the fundamental right of all employees
28

1 in the State of California to be paid wages in a timely fashion for their work.

2 55. At all times relevant during the liability period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff the
3 full amount of all owed wages when due as required by California Labor Code Section 204.

4 56. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all wages earned each pay period. Plaintiff is
5 informed, believes, and thereon alleges, that all times relevant during the liability period,
6 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not paying Plaintiff wages for all hours worked,
7 including overtime hours, the minimum wage, and premium pay for missed meal and rest
8 breaks.
9

10 57. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an
11 amount, subject to proof, to the extent she was not paid all wages each pay period. The precise
12 amount of unpaid wages is not presently known to Plaintiff but can be determined directly
13 from Defendants' records or indirectly based on information from Defendants' records.

14 58. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
15 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney's fees, and costs according to proof at
16 trial.
17

18 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES WHEN EMPLOYMENT ENDS**

20 **(California Labor Code Sections 201, 203)**

21 **(Plaintiff against all named defendants and all DOE defendants)**

22 59. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
23 paragraphs 1 through 58, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
24

25 60. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 201(a), an employer who discharges an
26 employee must immediately pay for all compensation due and owing.

27 61. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 202, when an employee resigns, the
28

1 employer must pay all compensation due and owing within 72 hours of resignation, or on the
2 employee's last day of work, if the employee gives more than 72 hours notice of resignation.

3 62. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 203, if an employer willfully fails to pay,
4 without abatement or reduction, any wages of an employee whose employment ends, the wages
5 of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date at the same rate until paid or until
6 an action is commenced; however, the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days for
7 failure to pay an employee owed wages.

8
9 63. After Plaintiff's employment with Defendants ended, Defendants willfully refused and
10 continue to refuse to pay her unpaid wages as required by Labor Code Section 203.

11 64. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
12 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney's fees, and costs according to proof at
13 trial. Moreover, Plaintiff prays for the above-mentioned money from 3 years immediately
14 preceding the filing of this lawsuit.

15
16 65. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff also prays for attorney's fees and costs under
17 California Labor Code Section 218.5 for time spent pursuing the non-payment of wages as set
18 forth herein. Plaintiff also prays for interest under California Labor Code Section 218.6.

19 66. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
20 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney's fees, and costs according to proof at
21 trial.

22
23 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO GIVE REST BREAKS**

25 **(Plaintiff against all named defendants and all DOE defendants)**

26 67. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
27 paragraphs 1 through 66, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
28

1 68. Plaintiff brings this cause of action under the following laws, for the following reasons:

- 2 a. Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations Sections 11040/11050(12)(A), which
3 provides that every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest
4 periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period.
5 The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the
6 rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof;
7
8 b. Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations Sections 11040/11050(12)(B), which
9 provides that if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in
10 accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the
11 employee one (1) hour of pay at employee's regular rate of compensation for each
12 workday that the rest period is not provided;
13
14 c. Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations sections 11040/11050(20)(A), which
15 penalizes the employer \$50.00 for each initial violation, per employee, of any
16 provision of the Wage Order, and \$100.00 for each additional violation thereafter
17 per employee; and
18
19 d. California Labor Code section 226.7, which states that (a) no employer shall require
20 any employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of
21 the Industrial Welfare Commission, and (b) if an employer fails to provide an
22 employee a rest period in accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial
23 Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) additional hour
24 of pay at employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest
25 period is not provided.

26 69. Plaintiff alleges that she was not authorized and permitted to take a ten (10) minute
27
28

1 rest break after every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, as required by California
2 law.

3 70. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for wages due to her under the statutes,
4 regulations, and wage orders alleged in this cause of action along with any allowable interest,
5 penalties, attorney's fees and costs according to proof at trial. Specifically, Plaintiff prays for
6 the foregoing moneys calculated from 3 years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit.

7 71. Plaintiff also prays for Labor Code section 218.5 recovery of costs and attorney's
8 fees as well as interest under Labor Code section 218.6.

9 72. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
10 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney's fees, and costs according to proof at
11 trial.
12

13 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO GIVE MEAL BREAKS**

15 **(Plaintiff against all named defendants and all DOE defendants)**

16 73. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
17 paragraphs 1 through 72, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
18

19 74. Plaintiff brings this cause of action under the following laws, for the following reasons:

- 20 a. California Labor Code section 512(a), which requires that employees be given a 30-
21 minute uninterrupted meal break after five (5) hours of work, and a second
22 uninterrupted meal break after ten (10) hours of work;
23
24 b. California Labor Code section 226.7, which states that (a) no employer shall require
25 any employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable order of
26 the Industrial Welfare Commission, and (b) if any employer fails to provide an
27 employee a meal period in accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial
28

Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided;

- c. California Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4/5 section 11(B), as codified under Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations Section 11040/11050, which states that if an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Wage Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided;
- d. California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 4/5 Section 7(A)(3), as codified under Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations Section 11040/11050, which requires an employer to maintain records documenting its employees' meal periods;
- e. California Industrial Welfare Commission wage order No. 4/5 Section 20(A), as codified under California Code of Regulations Section 11040/11050, which penalizes the employer \$50.00 for each initial violation, per employee, of any provision of the Wage Order, and \$100.00 for each additional violation thereafter per employee; and
- f. California Labor Code section 1171 and 1173, which have given the California Labor Commission jurisdiction to enact Wage Orders (such as Wage Order no. 4 or 7) as enforceable law.

75. Plaintiff alleges that she was not authorized and permitted to take relieved meal breaks after five (5) hours of work. Plaintiff further alleges that she was not authorized and permitted to take a second relieved meal break after ten (10) hours of work, as required by California

1 law. California Labor Code section 512(a) and California Industrial Welfare Commission
2 Order No. 4/5, as codified under California Code of Regulations Sections 11040/11050 et. seq.
3 requires that employees receive uninterrupted meal periods every five (5) hours of consecutive
4 work, and that the meal period be at least 30 minutes in length, wherein employee is relieved of
5 all work duty. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that employers may not require
6 their employees to work through their meal periods. California Labor Code section 226.7 and
7 California Code of Regulations section 11040/11050 requires that if the employer fails to
8 provide the employee with an uninterrupted meal period, the employer must pay the employee
9 one (1) hour of pay for each work day that the meal period is not given.
10

11 76. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for wages due to her under the statutes,
12 regulations, and wage orders alleged in this cause of action along with any allowable interest,
13 penalties, attorney's fees and costs according to proof at trial. Specifically, Plaintiff prays for
14 the foregoing moneys calculated from 3 years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit.
15

16 77. Plaintiff also prays for Labor Code section 218.5 recovery of costs and attorney's
17 fees as well as interest under Labor Code section 218.6.

18 78. Under this cause of action, Plaintiff prays for penalties due under the statutes alleged
19 along with any allowable interest, penalties, attorney's fees, and costs according to proof at
20 trial.

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR BUSINESS EXPENSES**

23 **(Plaintiff against All Named Defendants and all DOE defendants)**

24 79. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
25 paragraphs 1 through 78, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
26

27 80. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her
28

1 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
2 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

3 81. Beginning at least 3 years prior to the filing of this complaint, in order to discharge
4 their duties for Defendant, Plaintiff incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course
5 of completing her job duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant. These expenses
6 include, but are not limited to, use of personal cell phones for work purposes and use of
7 personal vehicles for work purposes. For instance, Plaintiff would utilize her cell phone
8 to call specific clients and had utilized her vehicle to drive to a different facility to visit a client
9 without getting reimbursed for mileage.
10

11 82. Plaintiff is entitled to reimbursement for these necessary expenditures, plus interest
12 and attorney’s fees and costs, under Labor Code section 2802.

13 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

15 **Representative Claim for PAGA penalties under California Labor Code sections 201,**
16 **202, 203, 204 and/or 204b, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 233, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5,**
1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802 and IWC Wage Orders 4/5)

17 **(Plaintiff against All Named Defendants and all DOE defendants)**

18 83. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
19 paragraphs 1 through 82, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

20 84. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California
21 Labor Code § 2699.3. By letter dated May 24, 2024, Plaintiff gave written notice by certified
22 mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants of the
23 specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the
24 facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

25 85. Pursuant to California Labor code section 2699.3, no response was received from
26 the LWDA within 65 days of the postmark date of the above-alleged letter.

27 86. Plaintiff therefore has exhausted all administrative remedies required of her under
28

1 California Labor Code sections 2698, 2699, and 2699.3, and, as a result, may prosecute this
2 cause of action and pursue penalties in a representative action for Defendants' violations of the
3 Labor Code.

4 87. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, any provisions of the Labor
5 Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its
6 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for violation of the code
7 may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee
8 on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures
9 specified in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

10 88. Plaintiff is an "aggrieved employee" because Plaintiff was employed by the alleged
11 violator and had one or more of the alleged violations committed against her, and therefore is
12 properly suited to represent the interests of other current and former employees, including all
13 current and former hourly, non-exempt employees who worked for SRO in the State of
14 California during the applicable PAGA Period.

15 89. Based on the acts alleged above, Plaintiff, on behalf of others, seeks penalties
16 under California Labor Code sections 2698 and 2699 because of Defendants' violations of
17 numerous provisions of the California Labor Code as alleged in this Complaint.

18 90. Plaintiff therefore has exhausted all administrative remedies required of her under
19 California Labor Code sections 2698, 2699, and 2699.3, and, as a result, may prosecute
20 this cause of action and pursue penalties in a representative action for Defendants' violations of
21 the Labor Code.

22 91. California Labor Code section 2699 et seq. imposes penalties upon culpable
23 Defendants for violating the Labor Code.

24 92. Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' misconduct as alleged herein as permitted by
25 law, but only those penalties that are required to be shared with the LWDA as Plaintiff is not
26 seeking individual penalties/victim specific relief or underpaid wages for herself or other
27 employees under this specific PAGA cause of action. Plaintiff has separate causes of action in
28 this Complaint for individual wages but is not seeking wages through the PAGA action.

93. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks penalties under California Labor Code

1 section 2699, for the following:

2 Violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, and/or 204b, 210, 226,
3 226.3, 226.7, 233, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
4 2800, 2802, and any other Labor Codes/Industrial Welfare Commission Order (No. 4/5)
5 violated based on the facts alleged in this Complaint.

6 94. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2698 et seq., Plaintiff seeks to recover attorney's fees,
7 costs, and civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved employees
8 as alleged herein in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial and within the jurisdictional
9 limits of this Court.

10 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200**

12 **(California Business and Professions Code Section 17200)**

13 **(Plaintiff against Single Room Occupancy Housing Corporation and all DOE**
14 **defendants)**

15
16 95. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in
17 paragraphs 1 through 94, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

18 96. By virtue of the foregoing statutes, regulations, and laws, the acts of Defendants
19 constitutes unfair and unlawful business practices under California Business and Professions
20 Code Section 17200, et seq.

21 97. Defendant's violations of the California labor laws and the Labor Code
22 constitutes a business practice because it was done repeatedly over a significant period of time
23 in a systematic manner that was detrimental to Plaintiff and other employees.

24 98. As a result of the acts of Defendants, as alleged herein, Plaintiff is entitled to
25 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of said suit as specifically provided in California Code of
26 Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 and California Business and Professions Code section 17200 et
27
28

1 seq.

2 99. As a result of the acts of Defendants, as alleged herein, Plaintiff is entitled to
3 multiple damages as specifically provided in California Business and Professions Code section
4 17200 et seq.
5

6 100. For the four years preceding the filing of this action, Plaintiff requests
7 restitution of all monies and profits to be disgorged from Defendants in an amount according to
8 proof at time of trial, but in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court.
9


10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

- 11 1. For compensatory damages including lost past and future wages, overtime,
12 commissions, and all other sums of money, including employment benefits, together
13 with interest on said amounts, and any other economic injury to Plaintiff, according to
14 proof;
15 2. For special and consequential damages to the extent allowed by law;
16 3. For restitution and disgorgement for all unfair business practices by corporate
17 Defendants against Plaintiff in an amount according to proof;
18 4. For an order enjoining corporate Defendants from further unfair and unlawful business
19 practices in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;
20 5. For damages and penalties against Defendants under Labor Code sections 203/204/210/
21 226 for Plaintiff in an amount subject to proof at trial;
22 6. For one hour of wages due to Plaintiff for each work period of more than five (5) hours
23 when Plaintiff did not receive an uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period.
24 7. For one hour of wages due to Plaintiff for each work period of at least three-and-a-half
25 (3.5) hours when Plaintiff did not receive an uninterrupted ten (10) minute rest period.
26 8. For maximum civil penalties available under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Order
27 against Defendant as described more particularly in the Complaint and Representative
28 PAGA claim/action;

- 1 9. For all remedies available to Plaintiff under the applicable Wage Order and the
2 Labor Code including an award of unpaid wages, attorney's fees, costs, interest,
3 liquidated damages, damages, penalties, and waiting time penalties according to proof
4 to the extent permitted by law;
5 10. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;
6 11. Reasonable attorney's fees where available by law, including but not limited to,
7 pursuant to the California Labor Code, including section 2698, and/or other
8 applicable laws; and
9 12. Costs and expenses of suit incurred herein;
10 13. For all interest as allowed by law;
11 14. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

12 DATED: September 3, 2024

MESSRELIAN LAW INC.

13 By 
14 _____

Harout Messrelian, Esq.


Attorneys for Plaintiff Kim Anderson

15
16
17
18 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

19 Plaintiff hereby demands, as a matter of right, a trial by jury in this case.

20
21 DATED: September 3, 2024

MESSRELIAN LAW INC.

22 By 
23 _____

Harout Messrelian, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff Kim Anderson