

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]

brian@lmlfirm.com

Peter J. Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 295611]

peter@lmlfirm.com

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513

Riverside, CA 92504

Tel: (951) 320-1444 | Fax: (951) 320-1445

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

DREW OLDFIELD, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

ADAME LANDSCAPE, INC., a California
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 20,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: Case No.: CVRI2402740
*[Assigned to Hon. Harold Hopp, Dept 1, for
all purposes]*

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (6) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (7) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
- (8) Unfair and Unlawful Competition;

PAGA CLAIMS

- (9) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (10) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (11) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (12) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (13) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (14) Failure to Timely Pay Wages;
- (15) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages; and
- (16) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff Drew Oldfield (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and
2 on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action against his former employer(s), Adame Landscape,
5 Inc., and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively, “Defendants”) on behalf of all current and
6 former nonexempt employees employed by Defendants in California (the “Class” or
7 “Represented Employees”) for Labor Code violations stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay
8 all wages owed, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide meal
9 periods, failure to provide rest breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely
10 pay wages each period and upon separation of employment, and failure to provide accurate
11 itemized wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and alleges on information and belief that
13 the Represented Employees were subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and
14 corresponding wage and hour violations to which Plaintiff was subjected during employment.

15 3. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
16 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
17 worked at the proper rate of pay, which led to frequent and reoccurring unpaid compensable
18 time. *Troester v. Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law “do[es] not allow
19 employers to require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without
20 compensation”); *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when
21 employee is under company’s control and where the tasks served the employer’s interests).

22 4. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Class often worked more than 8 hours per day
23 and/or 40 hours per week yet did not receive all required overtime compensation on such
24 occasions. Further, Plaintiff and the Class would often work at two or more base rates of pay in
25 the same workweek. Yet, when the Class worked overtime and worked at two or more base rates
26 of pay in the same workweek, Defendants illegally paid overtime at the “rate-in-effect” method
27 rather than using the correct “weighted average” method. See DLSE Manual § 49.2.6.2 (when an
28 employee performs prevailing and non prevailing jobs during the same workweek, the company

1 is required to pay overtime at the “weighted average” of the blended rate, averaging the normal
2 base hourly rate and prevailing wage rate). Also, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Class
3 were compensated on an hourly basis plus additional earned compensation (such as bonuses).
4 However, on the occasions when the Class worked overtime hours and received earned
5 additional compensation during the same workweek, Defendants failed to properly include these
6 amounts in the calculations for the regular rate of pay – in violation of California law.

7 5. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were also denied 30-minute off-duty
8 meal periods, as mandated by California law. As a result of Defendants’ policies and practices,
9 the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable
10 to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal period while under the
11 control of Defendants, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4) forced to take a meal
12 period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated second meal periods for shifts
13 in excess of 10 hours. Additionally, Defendants failed to record or keep accurate information
14 regarding when Represented Employees took their meal periods, in violation of the applicable
15 IWC Wage Order § 7(A)(3).

16 6. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Represented Employees with
17 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
18 mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks for Plaintiff, the
19 Represented Employees were unable to leave the job site for rest breaks, and the Represented
20 Employees and the Represented Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take
21 mandated rest breaks due to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Furthermore, on
22 occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees worked longer shifts, Defendants failed
23 to authorize and/or permit additional mandated rest breaks.

24 7. Moreover, at all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Represented
25 Employees to incur necessary business-related expenses and costs without reimbursement,
26 including, but not limited to, cellular phone expenses and expenses to provide tools and other
27 equipment (such as gloves) necessary to perform their tasks for Defendants.
28

1 8. Plaintiff further alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
2 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
3 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
4 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
5 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
6 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, wage premiums, vacation and sick wages, among others.

7 9. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
8 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

9 10. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants’ violations of the wage and hour components of
10 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their
11 level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over
12 its competitors.

13 11. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
14 Represented Employees’ employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees’
15 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
16 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
17 hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
18 underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

19 12. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, equitable, and monetary relief
20 against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees to
21 recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees, penalties, costs
22 and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6,
23 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199,
24 and 2802, among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the right
25 to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

26 **II. JURISDICTION**

27 13. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the
28 Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

1 **III. VENUE**

2 14. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil
3 Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in Riverside County, the unlawful acts alleged
4 herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in Riverside County, and
5 Defendants employs/employed Represented Employees in Riverside County.

6 **IV. PARTIES**

7 **Plaintiff**

8 15. Plaintiff and Class Representative Drew Oldfield was employed by Defendants
9 from approximately August 2022 through May 2024 and performed work for Defendants in
10 Riverside County.

11 **Defendants**

12 16. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Adame Landscape, Inc. is a California corporation
13 authorized to and doing business in Riverside County and is or was the legal employer of
14 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees during the applicable periods.

15 17. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of
16 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20,
17 inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for
18 the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Represented Employees by virtue of
19 Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious
20 names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE
21 Defendants when ascertained.

22 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he and the Represented
23 Employees worked under the joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and
24 each of them, acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants,
25 carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of
26 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a
27 unity of interest and ownership between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as
28 a single employer of Plaintiff and other Represented Employees.

1 19. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
2 Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single
3 employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human
4 resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally,
5 Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor
6 operations, and common ownership or financial control.

7 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting
8 themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active
9 concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in
10 all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times
11 Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the
12 agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining
13 co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and
14 purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of
15 their remaining co-Defendants.

16 21. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants
17 have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate
18 corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which
19 Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly,
20 the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed
21 jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the
22 separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege,
23 thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

24 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

25 22. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
26 as if fully alleged herein.

27 23. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as
28 a class action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

1 24. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning
2 four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

3 25. The Class, also referred to as the “Represented Employees,” that Plaintiff seeks to
4 represent is defined as follows:

5 All current and former nonexempt employees employed by
6 Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.

7 26. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

8 **Meal Break Subclass**

9 All Represented Employees who worked a shift in excess of
10 5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

11 **Rest Break Subclass**

12 All Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least
13 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

14 **Unreimbursed Expense Subclass**

15 All Represented Employees who were required to incur
16 expenses to discharge their duties for Defendants without
17 reimbursement during the Relevant Time Period.

18 **Waiting Time Penalties Subclass**

19 All Represented Employees who separated from their
20 employment with Defendants during the period three years
21 before the filing of this action and ending when final
22 judgment is entered.

23 **Wage Statement Penalties Subclass**

24 All Represented Employees during the period one year
25 before the filing of this action and ending when final
26 judgment is entered.

27 27. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class description with greater
28 specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues as appropriate.

1 28. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that he
2 seeks to represent.

3 29. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
4 under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the
5 litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

6 30. **Numerosity:** The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that
7 a joinder of all Represented Employees is impracticable. Although the exact number is currently
8 unknown to Plaintiff, this information is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

9 31. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which
10 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including
11 without limitation:

12 i. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
13 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all
14 hours worked;

15 ii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
16 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
17 Employees for hours above 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week;

18 iii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
19 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Meal Break
20 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
21 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a compliant
22 meal period was not provided;

23 iv. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
24 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Rest Break
25 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass
26 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a paid rest
27 break was not provided;

1 v. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
2 IWC Wage Order by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for
3 business expenses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of
4 their employer;

5 vi. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
6 timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment between Defendants and Plaintiff and
7 the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass, whether such separation was voluntary or involuntary;

8 vii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
9 provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized
10 wage statements;

11 viii. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§
12 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest
13 breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, and
14 failure to timely pay final wages; and

15 ix. Whether Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to equitable
16 relief pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

17 32. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims, as the Class Representative, are typical of the
18 claims of The Class. Plaintiff, like other members of The Class, was subjected to Defendants'
19 ongoing Labor Code and Wage Order violations including pertaining to the failure to pay all
20 wages owed, failure to provide mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to reimburse
21 business expenses, failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and failure to
22 provide accurate itemized wage statements.

23 33. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff, as Class Representative, will fairly and
24 adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's interests are not in conflict
25 with those of the Class. Class Representative's counsel are competent and experienced in
26 litigating employment class actions and other complex litigation matters similar to this case.

27 34. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class
28 action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this

1 controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of
2 law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual
3 members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to
4 recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action
5 treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is
6 most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

9 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

10 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

11 35. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
12 as if fully alleged herein.

13 36. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement
14 to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage (and/or the agreed-upon wage or
15 proper prevailing wage) throughout the statutory period for each hour worked.

16 37. As noted herein, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided
17 proper minimum and regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and
18 compensate for all hours worked at the proper rate of pay. As a result of this policy and practice,
19 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required to perform off-the-clock work that
20 Defendants either knew or should have known they were performing.

21 38. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
22 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order § 4, and Cal. Code
23 Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

24 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
25 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
26 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 223, 1194 and 1197.

27 40. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
28 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each

1 hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay
2 them in accordance thereto.

3 41. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
4 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
5 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
6 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
7 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

8 42. During employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
9 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

10 43. As a result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
11 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

12 44. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
13 all unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs,
14 under Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1194.2, against Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

17 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

18 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

19 45. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
20 as if fully alleged herein.

21 46. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were employees of Defendants who did
22 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

23 47. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
24 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
25 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
26 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
27 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
28 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

1 48. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required by
2 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, as a
3 result of the policies and practices described in this Complaint, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff
4 and the Represented Employees proper overtime wages for all overtime hours worked.

5 49. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
6 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees because
7 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
8 week without proper overtime compensation.

9 50. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
10 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
11 Represented Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

12 51. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
13 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid proper overtime wages throughout the statutory
14 period, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

15 52. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
16 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
17 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
18 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
19 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

20 53. During the employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
21 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

22 54. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
23 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

24 55. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
25 all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against
26 Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

27 ///

28 ///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

26
27
28

1 additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

2 63. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass did not
3 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
4 obtained from Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not willfully obtained, were not
5 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
6 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
7 to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

8 64. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Meal
9 Break Subclass all mandated meal breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
10 meal breaks, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

11 65. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
12 periods as required by California law and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of
13 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
14 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
15 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal period was not
16 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

17 66. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
18 and IWC Wage Order § 11, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Meal
19 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

22 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

23 *Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

24 67. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
25 as if fully alleged herein.

26 68. Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
27 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.
28

69. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

70. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

71. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

72. At all relevant times, and as a result of the policies and practices described in this Complaint, Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were denied mandated paid rest breaks.

73. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided with all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

74. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass all mandated rest breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

75. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with rest breaks as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of each rest break not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage Order § 12. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a paid rest break was not lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

76. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage Order § 12, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

3 (Labor Code § 2802)

4 *Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass Against All Defendants*

5 77. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 78. Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass are and/or were employees of
8 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing
9 reimbursement of business expenses.

10 79. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
11 expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of
12 their employer.

13 80. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a)
14 when they failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for expenses
15 incurred as a direct consequence of employment with Defendants and/or under the direction of
16 Defendants.

17 81. As a direct result of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 2802 and IWC Wage
18 Order § 9(B), Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass have suffered, and continue to
19 suffer, substantial losses related to such incurred expenses, expenses, and attorney's fees in
20 seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their obligations under the law, all in an amount
21 to be proved at time of trial.

22 82. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2802, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees seek to
23 recover the unreimbursed expenses, interest on the unreimbursed expenses, and the costs and
24 attorney's fees necessarily incurred in pursuing same. The exact amount of reimbursements,
25 interest, costs, and attorney's fees will be in an amount to be proved at the time of trial.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

4 *Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass Against All Defendants*

5 83. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 84. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
8 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing
9 and payment of wages.

10 85. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
11 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

12 86. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
13 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
14 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

15 87. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
16 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
17 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

18 88. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby
19 Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass were not paid all wages due and owing upon
20 separation of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

21 89. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all
22 wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass upon separation of
23 employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, meal and rest
24 period premiums, and vested vacation wages.

25 90. Additionally, at all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay all mandated sick
26 wages owed to the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass at the proper rate of pay under Labor Code §
27 246(l), leading to a failure to pay all wages owed upon separation of employment.
28

1 91. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
2 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass all
3 wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and
4 202. Consequently, pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendants owe Plaintiff and the Waiting
5 Time Penalties Subclass the above-described waiting time penalty, all in an amount to be shown
6 according to proof at trial and within the jurisdiction of this Court.

7 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

9 (Labor Code § 226)

10 *Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass Against All Defendants*

11 92. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
12 as if fully alleged herein.

13 93. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
14 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
15 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

16 94. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
17 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
18 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
19 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
20 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
21 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

22 95. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
23 and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass due to violations including: failure to accurately state
24 total hours worked (for example, the wage statements failed to accurately state total hours
25 worked and/or reflect the correct compensable hours); failure to accurately state gross wages
26 earned, all deductions, and net wages earned (due to, for example, the failure to pay all required
27 minimum and overtime wages); failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate
28 overtime rate of pay); failure to state the inclusive dates of the pay period; failure to accurately

1 state the name and address of the legal entity of the employer; and failure to accurately state the
2 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

3 96. Moreover, Defendants' wage statements directly violated Labor Code § 226(a)
4 each period due to the failure to pay and report premium wages for denied meal periods and rest
5 breaks under § 226.7.

6 97. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
7 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a
8 wage statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
9 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

10 98. Defendants' failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the
11 Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the rate of
12 pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Wage
13 Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting miscalculation of wages, all of
14 which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said Defendants. As a direct result,
15 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered and continue to suffer,
16 substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and
17 expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation
18 under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to proof at trial.

19 99. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
20 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered an injury in
21 that each was prevented from knowing, understanding and disputing the wage payments paid to
22 them. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have each suffered an
23 injury in that the failure to show all wages earned on the itemized wage statements resulted in
24 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees being denied all necessary deductions, payments, and
25 withholdings owed by the employer, including, but not limited to, the failure to make all
26 necessary contributions for unemployment benefits, social security benefits, proper payment of
27 taxes and withholdings, and other mandated state and federal benefits.
28

100. Plaintiff has also been injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

101. Labor Code § 226(e) requires Defendants to pay the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods, plus attorney's fees and costs, to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass who were injured by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a). The exact amount of the applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION

(Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*)

Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants

102. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

103. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair competition, which includes any “unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.” The Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact, due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

104. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under Business & Professions Code § 17021.

105. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California's wage and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses, and failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, all to decrease their costs and increase profits.

106. At all times relevant herein, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees wages and monies and other financial obligations to which they were entitled.

1 107. As a result of Defendants' failure to comply with the Labor Code and IWC
2 Orders, Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, suffered a loss of wages and monies, all in
3 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. Defendants' ongoing violations of the
4 foregoing statutes and laws constitute a violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*

5 108. Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders and
6 its scheme to lower its payroll costs as alleged herein, constitute unlawful and unfair business
7 practices because it was done in a systematic manner over a period of time to the detriment of the
8 Plaintiff and all others similarly-situated.

9 109. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
10 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
11 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
12 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

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

19 111. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is entitled to,
20 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge the profits which Defendants have
21 acquired, or of which Plaintiff and Represented Employees have been deprived, by means of the
22 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the
23 Represented Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the unfair
24 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

25 112. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
26 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
27 unlawful and/or fraudulent.
28

1 113. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and
2 Represented Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
3 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; an
4 order requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Represented
5 Employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5
6 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

7 **VI. PAGA CAUSES OF ACTION (Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)**

8 114. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as she was employed by
9 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
10 violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil
11 action filed on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved
12 employees in California against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed
13 (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

14 115. Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to
15 Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys' fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by
16 PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court
17 in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Therefore, Plaintiff is not required to, nor
18 does she, seek class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

19 116. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing
20 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to
21 Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including
22 the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have
23 elapsed since the date Plaintiff provided the written notice of the claims alleged herein without
24 the LWDA assuming jurisdiction over the claims alleged. Accordingly, Plaintiff has fully
25 satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit under the PAGA.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 117. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 118. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to
8 be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each
9 hour worked.

10 119. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and
11 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
12 worked at the proper rate of pay. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the
13 Aggrieved Employees were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew
14 or should have known they were performing.

15 120. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
16 the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked.

17 121. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
18 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and Cal. Code
19 Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

20 122. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
21 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
22 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 223, 1194 and 1197.

23 123. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
24 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
25 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

124. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

125. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

126. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12) in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

127. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to Defendants' practices described herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked at the proper rate of pay.

128. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week without proper overtime compensation.

129. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

130. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

137. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees one additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

1 138. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
2 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
3 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
4 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
5 unlawful adherence. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
6 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

7 139. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
8 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
9 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

10 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

12 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

13 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

14 140. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
15 as if fully alleged herein.

16 141. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
17 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

18 142. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
19 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

20 143. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
21 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
22 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
23 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
24 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

25 144. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
26 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
27 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.
28

1 145. At all relevant times, and due to the policies and practices described herein,
2 Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with 10 minutes of net rest
3 break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as mandated by California law.

4 146. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
5 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
6 all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
7 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

8 147. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
9 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
10 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

11 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

13 (Labor Code § 2802)

14 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

15 148. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
16 as if fully alleged herein.

17 149. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
18 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing reimbursement of
19 business expenses.

20 150. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
21 expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of
22 their employer.

23 151. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a)
24 when they failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for expenses incurred as a
25 direct consequence of employment with Defendants and/or under the direction of Defendants.

26 152. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
27 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
28 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

1 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

3 (Labor Code § 204)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 153. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 154. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
8 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the timing of payment
9 of wages each period.

10 155. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
11 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
12 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
13 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
14 the following month.

15 156. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states “[t]he requirements of this section shall
16 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
17 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.”

18 157. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the
19 Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each period within the time required by
20 Labor Code § 204. Moreover, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
21 Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited to,
22 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums and sick time
23 at the proper rate, within the time specified by Labor Code § 204.

24 158. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
25 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
26 and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 159. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 160. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
8 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing and
9 payment of final wages.

10 161. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
11 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

12 162. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
13 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
14 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

15 163. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
16 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
17 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

18 164. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
19 Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not
20 limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, vacation and sick pay at the proper rates, and
21 meal and rest period premiums, within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

22 165. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
23 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
24 due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

25 166. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
26 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
27 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

28 ///

1 **SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

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

4 (Labor Code § 226)

5 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

6 167. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
7 as if fully alleged herein.

8 168. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
9 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of
10 accurate itemized wage statements.

11 169. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
12 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
13 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
14 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
15 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
16 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

17 170. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
18 and the Aggrieved Employees due to violations including: failure to accurately state total hours
19 worked (for example, the wage statements failed to accurately reflect the compensable hours
20 worked); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to accurately state all deductions;
21 failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including
22 the accurate overtime rate of pay); failure to accurately state the corresponding number of hours
23 worked at each hourly rate; and failure to accurately identify the name and address of the legal
24 entity of the employer.

25 171. Additionally, Defendants' wage statements directly violated Labor Code § 226(a)
26 each period due to the failure to pay and report premium wages for denied meal periods and rest
27 breaks under § 226.7.
28

1 172. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
2 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
3 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

4 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and all others
6 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
7 follows:

8 1. As to the Ninth through Sixteenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all
9 applicable and available remedies under PAGA;

10 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under PAGA;

11 3. That the First through Eighth Causes of Action be certified as a class action;

12 4. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;

13 5. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;

14 6. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Eighth
15 Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and
16 Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;

17 7. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by
18 law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;

19 8. For restitution as provided by the Labor Code and Business and Professions Code
20 § 17200, *et seq.*;

21 9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200,
22 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194,
23 1197, 1198, 1199, and 2802, among other sections inadvertently omitted;

24 10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
25 not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties, including interest thereon;

26 11. For pre- and post-judgment interest; and

27 12. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Dated: July 22, 2024

BY: 
 Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
 Peter J. Carlson, Esq.
 Attorneys for Plaintiff

[illegible]

On July 22, 2024, I caused to be served the foregoing document(s) described as follows:

Tracie Chiarito
Tracie Chiarito, Declarant

SERVICE LIST

Robert A. Davis, Jr., Esq.

rob@dw.law

Rebecca O’Kray-Murphy, Esq.

rebecca@dw.law

DAVIS & WOJCIK

1001 E. Norton Place, #A

Hemet, CA 92543

951-652-9000

951-658-8308-fax

Attorneys for Defendant ADAME LANDSCAPE, INC.