

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
phaines@haineslawgroup.com
Sean M. Blakely (SBN 264384)
sblakely@haineslawgroup.com
Alexandra R. McIntosh (SBN 320904)
amcintosh@haineslawgroup.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 292-2350
Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
7/26/2024 9:30 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By N. Alvarez, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

GIOVANNY PACHECO, as an individual
and on behalf of all other aggrieved
employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AT&T MOBILITY SERVICES LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24STCV18584

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

**(1) CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT (LABOR CODE § 2698 *et seq.*)**

UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE

1 Plaintiff Giovanni Pacheco (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved
2 employees, hereby brings this Representative Action Complaint against Defendants AT&T
3 Mobility Services LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive
4 (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees, hereby brings
7 this representative action for recovery of civil penalties under California Labor Code §§ 2698 *et*
8 *seq.*

9 2. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
10 Defendants are citizens of California, Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in
11 California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves to the California market so as to render
12 the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with the traditional
13 notions of fair play and substantial justice.

14 **VENUE**

15 3. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California
16 Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts and omissions
17 complained of herein occurred in the County of Los Angeles. Further, at all times relevant herein
18 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within the County of Los Angeles.

19 **PARTIES**

20 4. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein,
21 Plaintiff was, and currently is, a California resident, residing in the County of Los Angeles.
22 During the one year immediately preceding Plaintiff’s giving of the required notice under the
23 PAGA, and within the statute of limitations periods applicable to the cause of action pled herein,
24 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as an employee classified as exempt under Industrial
25 Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 7.

26 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the one
27 year preceding Plaintiff’s giving of the required notice under the PAGA and continuing to the
28 present, Defendants did (and do) business by providing wireless communication services and

1 products to customers throughout California and the United States and employed Plaintiff and
2 other similarly situated exempt employees within the County of Los Angeles and, therefore, were
3 (and are) doing business in the County of Los Angeles and the State of California.

4 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
5 herein, Defendants were licensed to do business in California and the County of Los Angeles, and
6 were the employers of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees (as defined in Paragraph 15).

7 7. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner,
8 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said
9 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
10 amend this Representative Action Complaint when such true names and capacities are
11 discovered. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious
12 defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate, were responsible in some manner for the
13 acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
14 Employees (as defined in Paragraph 15) to be subject to the unlawful employment practices,
15 wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

16 8. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
17 herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees (as
18 defined in Paragraph 15).

19 9. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing
20 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendant; and furthermore, the
21 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one
22 of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned
23 were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each
24 of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or
25 omissions complained of herein.

26 10. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of
27 and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course
28 and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further,

1 Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and the
2 Aggrieved Employees (as defined in Paragraph 15).

3 **REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

4 11. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a Store Manager in various locations in
5 Southern California, including in Lakewood, California, from approximately 2013 until
6 approximately June 2, 2023, and was classified as an exempt employee during this time. Plaintiff
7 brings this action on behalf of all other employees of Defendants who were classified as exempt
8 employees during the relevant time period (collectively “aggrieved employees”).

9 12. During his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees
10 were not provided all required meal periods, which include duty-free 30-minute meal periods
11 commencing prior to the beginning of the fifth hour of work, due to Defendants’ classification
12 of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as exempt employees. When Plaintiff and other
13 aggrieved employees worked shifts in excess of 10.0 hours, Defendants did not provide a second
14 duty-free 30-minute meal period. Moreover, Defendants did not require Plaintiff or any other
15 aggrieved employees to clock out for their meal periods, nor did it track the time that meal
16 periods were being provided.

17 13. Labor Code Section 512(a) states that: “An employer shall not employ an
18 employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee
19 with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the
20 employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both
21 the employer and employee. An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
22 more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not
23 less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second
24 meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first
25 meal period was not waived.”

26 14. Notably, Labor Code Section 512(a) makes no distinction between exempt and
27 non-exempt employees, although Section 512(c) and (e) exclude other classes of workers, and
28 other Sections of the Labor Code (e.g., Sections 204.3, 2810.3, and 2810.5, do expressly exclude

1 exempt workers from coverage). Similarly, the DLSE Manual at Section 45.2.2 confirms that
2 Section 512(a) does not exclude any class of employee. *Id.* (“Note: Labor Code § 512, requiring
3 an employer to provide a meal period, does not exclude any class of employee. Consequently, it
4 would appear that exempt employees are also entitled to meal periods in accordance with that
5 section.”).

6 15. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to represent himself and other aggrieved
7 employees, as defined by Labor Code § 2699(c), who have been aggrieved by the Labor Code
8 violations discussed herein.

9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

11 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

12 16. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as though
13 fully set forth herein.

14 17. Defendants have committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff and
15 other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff, an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor
16 Code § 2698 *et seq.*, acting on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees, brings this
17 representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other
18 aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof, including, but not limited
19 to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200.00 for
20 each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for
21 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for
22 each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per
23 employee per pay period; (3) \$250.00 for each initial violation; and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent
24 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (4) \$100.00 for
25 each initial violation and \$200.00 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for
26 those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on
27 the following Labor Code violations:

28 a. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods to Plaintiff and other

aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code § 512; and

- b. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees of their hours worked, including the times that they began and ended the workday and the beginning and end of their meal periods, in violation of Labor Code § 1174.

18. On or about May 9, 2024, Plaintiff notified Defendant Bank of America, National Association via certified mail, and the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* with respect to violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 17 (a)-(b). Now that sixty-five days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants of these violations, Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

19. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and the interests of other aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff has thereby incurred attorneys’ fees and costs, which he is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. Upon the First Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per

1 pay period; and/or (4) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation
2 per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is
3 specifically provided, based on the Labor Code violations identified in Paragraph 17 (a)-(b);


4 2. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §
5 2699(g) and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

6 3. For such other and further relief the Court may deem just and proper.

7
8 Dated: July 19, 2024

Respectfully submitted,
HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

9
10 By:

Paul K. Haines
Sean M. Blakely
Attorneys for Plaintiff