

MILLS SADAT DOWLAT LLP
Arash Sadat (SBN 279282)
Camron Dowlatsahi (SBN 308618)
333 South Hope Street, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel.: (213) 628-3856
Email: arash@msdlawyers.com
Email: camron@msdlawyers.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

E-FILED
10/9/2024 9:17 AM
Superior Court of California
County of Fresno
By: P. Shaeffer, Deputy

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

LUIS ZUNIGA, individually, and on behalf
of other members of the general public
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

JESSE AGUIRRE AND KRISTY
AGUIRRE DBA J.K MORTUARY
SERVICES, a California corporation, and
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. [24CECG04380](#)

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wage for All Hours Worked (Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1197.1)**
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation (Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198)**
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Orders)**
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Orders)**
- (5) Waiting Time Penalties (Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**
- (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements (Lab. Code § 226)**
- (7) Violation of Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.)**
- (8) Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.)**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

THE PARTIES..... 3

 A. Plaintiff 3

 B. Defendants 3

VENUE AND JURISDICTION 4

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION..... 4

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION 11

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION 12

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION 13

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION 15

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION 16

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION 17

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION..... 17

EIGHT CAUSE OF ACTION 19

PRAYER FOR RELIEF 22

1 Plaintiff Luis Zuniga, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public
2 similarly situated, by and through his undersigned counsel, brings this action against Defendant
3 Jesse Aguirre and Kristy Aguirre dba J.K Mortuary Services, and Does 1 through 10, inclusive,
4 and alleges as follows:

5 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

6 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant Jesse Aguirre and Kristy Aguirre dba
7 J.K Mortuary Services, and Does 1 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for
8 California Labor Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure
9 to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods,
10 failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked
11 and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify
12 necessary business expenses and failure to furnish accurate wage statements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
24 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
25 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Class. Further, Defendants are
26 responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of
27 "responent superior".

28 //

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

8. Plaintiff Luis Zuniga ("Plaintiff") is an individual residing in the County of Fresno, California.

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

B. Defendants

10. Plaintiff is informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Jesse Aguirre and Kristy Aguirre dba J.K Mortuary Services ("J.K Mortuary") is:

(a) a California corporation with its principal place of business in Ben Lomond, California.

(b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Fresno County;

(c) The current or former employer of Plaintiff and of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Class to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions; and

(d) At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, are and were doing business as Jesse Aguirre and Kristy Aguirre dba J.K Mortuary Services.

11. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged and that Plaintiff's damages were proximately caused by said defendants' conduct.

//

//

12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Class in the State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

13. The wrongful conduct alleged against the Defendants occurred in the County of Fresno, California. At all times relevant hereto, the conduct at issue was part of a continuous and ongoing pattern of behavior.

14. This Court is the proper forum to adjudicate this action because the wrongful acts that are the subject of this action occurred here, the Defendant now resides in its jurisdictional area, and injury to person occurred in its jurisdictional area.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked (including minimum wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish

1 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
2 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

3 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
4 paying Plaintiff and the Class for all hours worked. Defendants failed to incorporate all
5 remuneration when calculating the correct rate of pay and meal and rest break premium rate of
6 pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiff and the Class.

7 17. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendants failed to
8 maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Class worked.

9 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff
10 and the Class with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required
11 Plaintiff and the Class to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing timely
12 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or
13 without compensating Plaintiff and the Class for meal periods that were not provided by the end of
14 the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff
15 and the Class of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts
16 greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and
17 practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Class in compliance with California
18 law.

19 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
20 and permit Plaintiff and the Class to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants always
21 required Plaintiff and the Class to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without
22 Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted,
23 rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating
24 Plaintiff and the Class for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did
25 not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Class of their right to take a rest period. Moreover,
26 Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for
27 Plaintiff and the Class, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing
28

1 of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether
2 Plaintiff and the Class were taking their required rest periods.

3 20. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods,
4 and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Class took rest periods during
5 the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize
6 and permit Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

7 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
8 pay Plaintiff and the Class during and at the conclusion of their employment all wages for all
9 minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages.

10 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Class
11 with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net
12 wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked, correct
13 wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct
14 wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California
15 law). As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Class
16 suffered injury because, among other things:

- 17 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum
18 wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium
19 wages to which they were entitled, even though they were entitled;
- 20 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, meal period
21 premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;
- 22 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, meal
23 period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even
24 though they were;
- 25 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime, meal
26 period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even
27 though they had not been;

28 //

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

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

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

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

24. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seek relief authorized by California law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the
13 interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined
14 community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has
15 no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's
16 attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action
17 discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the
18 duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have
19 been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the
20 substantial benefit of each class member.

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

- 23 1. The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the
24 prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 25 2. The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already
26 commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 27 3. The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims
28 in the particular forum; and

1 4. The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class
2 action.

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

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

- 14 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum wages, and
15 overtime wages;
16 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class
17 Members;
18 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to
19 Class Members;
20 (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge or
21 resignation;
22 (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and all
23 meal periods Class Members took or missed;
24 (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; and
25 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et. seq. as a result of
26 their illegal conduct as described above.

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

- 1 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question
2 affecting only individual members;
- 3 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient
4 adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 5 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
6 members of the class before the Court;
- 7 (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain effective
8 and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- 9 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief
10 for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the
11 damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient
12 to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- 13 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual
14 members of the class would create a risk of:
- 15 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of
16 the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for
17 Defendants; and/or
- 18 2. Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a
19 practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties
20 to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to
21 protect their interests, including but not limited to the potential for
22 exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be,
23 responsible Defendants; and,
- 24 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the
25 Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the class as
26 a whole.

27 31. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of
28 the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own

business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiff would contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

first CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Minimum Wage for All Hours Worked (Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1197.1);

(Against All Defendants)

32. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

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

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

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

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

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

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

39. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

40. Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiff and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and the Class all such wages due and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

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

second CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Overtime Compensation (Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198)

(Against All Defendants)

42. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

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

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

//

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

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

7 47. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
8 compensation to the Plaintiff and the Class for their overtime hours worked, Plaintiff and the Class
9 have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to
10 them but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained
11 according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Orders)**

26 (Against All Defendants)

27 51. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
28 fully herein.

1 52. At all relevant times, Defendants were aware of and were under a duty to comply
2 with Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable sections of IWC Wage Orders.

3 53. Labor Code section 512 prohibits an employer from employing an employee for a
4 work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of
5 not less than 30 minutes, or for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the
6 employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

7 54. Section 11 of Wage Order No. 4 provides, and at all times relevant hereto provided,
8 in relevant part that:

9 No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours
10 without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period
11 of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may
12 be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee. Unless the employee
13 is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be
14 considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. An "on duty"
15 meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
16 employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between
17 the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall
18 state that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time. If an
19 employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the
20 applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1)
21 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that
22 the meal period is not provided.

23 55. Labor Code section 226.7 prohibits any employer from requiring any employee to
24 work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable IWC wage order, and provides that
25 an employer that fails to provide an employee with a required rest break or meal period shall pay
26 that employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each
27 work day that the employer does not provide a compliant meal or rest period.

28 //

56. Defendants knowingly failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with meal periods as required by law. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with any payment of meal premiums. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal break(s), plus interest thereon.

57. Plaintiff and the Class have therefore been damaged and are entitled to payment of the meal period premiums as provided by law.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Orders)

(Against All Defendants)

58. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

59. Section 12 of Wage Order No. 4 provides, and at all times relevant hereto provided, in relevant 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. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However, a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages. If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.

60. Labor Code section 226.7 prohibits any employer from requiring any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable IWC wage order, and provides that an employer that fails to provide an employee with a required rest break or meal period shall pay

1 that employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each
2 work day that the employer does not provide a compliant meal or rest period.

3 61. Defendants knowingly failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with rest periods as
4 required by law, and knowingly failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods as
5 required by law. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with any payment of rest
6 premiums. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each
7 workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

8 62. Plaintiff and the Class have therefore been damaged and are entitled to payment of
9 the meal and rest period premiums as provided by law.

10 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Waiting Time Penalties (Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**

12 (Against All Defendants)

13 63. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
14 fully herein.

15 64. Labor Code sections 201 and 202 require an employer to pay its employees all
16 wages due immediately upon discharge or within 72 hours of resignation. This requirement
17 applies to unpaid overtime wages. Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully
18 fails to pay such wages, the employer must continue to pay the subject employee's wages until the
19 back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced, up to a maximum of thirty days of wages.

20 65. Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class their earned and unpaid
21 wages for 30 days from the time such wages should have been paid under the Labor Code.

22 66. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to pay owed wages upon separation from
23 employment, Plaintiff and the Class have been harmed and Defendants are liable for statutory
24 waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 203.

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements (Lab. Code § 226)**

3 (Against All Defendants)

4 67. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
5 fully herein.

6 68. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) requires employers to provide employees,
7 semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, with a statement that accurately reflects
8 certain itemized information including total number of hours worked.

9 69. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Class
10 with timely and accurate wage statements that accurately reflected the total number of hours
11 worked and wages earned, as required by Labor Code section 226.

12 70. As a result of Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements,
13 Plaintiff and the Class suffered actual damages and harm by being unable to determine the amount
14 of overtime worked each pay period in a timely manner, which prevented them from asserting their
15 rights under California law.

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

21 72. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages
22 caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).

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

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Violation of Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*)**

3 (Against All Defendants)

4 74. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
5 fully herein.

6 75. Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* (“UCL”) prohibits any
7 “unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice.” Defendants have engaged in unlawful
8 activity as follows:

- 9 (a) Violations of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1198 for failure to pay
10 minimum wages, including overtime wages;
11 (b) Violations of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal
12 periods and rest breaks;
13 (c) Violations of Labor Code section 226 for failure to provide accurate wage
14 statements;
15 (d) Violation of Labor Code section 2802 for failure to indemnify necessary
16 business expenses;
17 (e) Violations of Labor Code sections 201-203 for failure to pay accrued wages
18 upon separation of employment;

19 76. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
20 herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiff, and all
21 persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, of
22 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

23 77. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
24 Defendants’ wrongful conduct.

25 78. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled to,
26 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
27 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived, by
28 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and

1 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
2 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

3 79. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, is further
4 entitled to and does seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
5 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them,
6 from engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices
7 in the future.

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

15 81. Plaintiff also alleges that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
16 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
17 withholdings.

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

24 **EIGHT CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.)**

26 (Against All Defendants)

27 83. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth
28 fully herein.

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

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

10 86. Plaintiff has exhausted their administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
11 Code § 2699.3. On May 6, 2024, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and
12 Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of
13 the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved
14 employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. (Attached as **Exhibit A**).
15 Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1026537-24.

16 87. At the time of this filing, the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not
17 indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice.
18 If it does so, Plaintiff will amend his complaint. Otherwise, Plaintiff may commence a civil action
19 to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor
20 Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under
21 California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

22 88. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California Labor
23 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
24 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by
25 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
26 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins
27 and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

28 //

1 89. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall
2 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

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

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

24 92. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs
25 pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any
26 action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

27 //

28 //

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

4 **Class Certification**

- 5 1. That this action be certified as a class action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382;
6 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representatives of the Class; and
7 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

8 **As to the First Cause of Action**

- 9 4. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§
10 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
11 minimum wages due;
12 5. For general unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
13 6. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
14 such amounts were due;
15 7. For liquidated damages;
16 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to Labor
17 Code § 1194(a); and,
18 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

19 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

- 20 10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
21 Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all
22 overtime wages due;
23 11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;
24 12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
25 from the date such amounts were due;
26 13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
27 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
28 14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Third Cause of Action

15. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;
17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;
22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 the IWC Wage Orders;
26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be appropriate;
27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

//

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment;
31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ;
32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;
33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;
36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);
37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to Labor Code § 226(h);
38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
39. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;
41. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

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

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

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

10 As to the Ninth Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

21 As to all Causes of Action

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

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 Dated: October 9, 2024

MILLS SADAT DOWLAT LLP

2
3 By:



4
5 Camron Dowlatshahi

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
7 and the Putative Class
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

May 6, 2024

**VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION;
VIA CERTIFIED MAIL TO OPPOSING PARTY**

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Jesse Aguirre and Kristi Aguirre dba J.K Mortuary Services
9015 Glen Arbor Road
Ben Lomond, CA 95005

Re: Notice of Claim Under Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”)

To Whom It May Concern:

My firm represents Luis Zuniga (“Plaintiff”) and all other aggrieved employees who intend to file an action against Jesse Aguirre and Kristi Aguirre dba J.K Mortuary Services (“Defendant” or “J.K Mortuary”) in connection with Defendant’s violations of the California Labor Code. This letter shall serve as notice, and a request, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), that the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) investigate the violations by Defendant described herein against Plaintiff and other current and/or former employees. If LWDA does not intend to investigate the violations described herein, we respectfully request that the agency specifically notify our office of the same at your earliest possible opportunity.

Statement of Specific Provisions of the Labor Code Violated

Plaintiffs intend to prosecute a civil action against Defendant for violations of Labor Code sections 226, subdivision (a), 226.7, 226.8, subdivision (a), 558, 1182.12, and 2750.3.

Facts and Theories in Support of Violations

Defendant provides mortuary services and is registered to do business in the State of California. Defendant employed Plaintiff from on or about January 25, 2023 to February 26, 2024. Plaintiff worked as a driver.

Plaintiff’s position as a driver, and his duties are within the purview of Defendant’s usual course of business as mortuary service company. Moreover, Defendant exercised requisite control over Plaintiff by setting Plaintiff’s hours, providing training, and providing equipment. As a result, Plaintiff was Defendant’s employee.

However, Defendant misclassified Plaintiff as an independent contractor when it hired him in 2023. Defendant willfully misclassified Plaintiff in an attempt to avoid providing Plaintiff with meal and rest breaks, overtime, and accurate wage statements. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant misclassified many of its other employees as independent contractors, as well.

Misclassification as an Independent Contractor

Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.8, it is unlawful for an employer to willfully misclassify an individual as an independent contractor.

An employer in violation of section 226.8 is subject to civil penalties. (*See* Lab. Code § 226.8, subds. (b)-(c).) The California Supreme Court has set forth the stringent requirements for an individual to be considered an independent contractor. (*Dynamex Operations v. Superior Court* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 903.) The “ABC test” as articulated in *Dynamex* requires the following:

- (a) that the worker is free from the control and direction of the hiring entity in connection with the performance of the work, both under the contract for the performance of the work and in fact;
- (b) that the worker performs work that is outside the usual course of the hiring entity’s business; and
- (c) that the worker is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business of the same nature as the work performed.

These requirements have been codified in Labor Code section 2750.3. Because the test is phrased in the conjunctive, all three prongs of the ABC test must be answered in the affirmative for a worker to be lawfully classified as an independent contractor.

Here, none of the prongs are satisfied. Plaintiff and other drivers working for Defendant were undoubtedly employees and not independent contractors under the ABC test. First, the employees’ schedules were set by Defendant and Defendant directed the work they would perform.

Plaintiff’s experience was consistent with this term of employment, as Defendant: (a) provided a schedule which instructed him where and when he would work; and (b) directed nearly aspect of the moving services he provided. The same was true of Defendant’s other drivers who were also misclassified as independent contractors.

Finally, transporting deceased bodies is not an independently established trade, nor were Plaintiff or Defendant’s other employees providing such services to other companies or individuals. Nearly all of these employees worked only for Defendant.

Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements

Pursuant to Labor Code section 226 (“Section 226”), subdivision (a), an employer is required to provide itemized wage statements. Plaintiff was issued inaccurate wage statements, which failed to list premium pay and all hours worked. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant failed to notify other employees of their premium pay for each payroll period and their accurate total of hours worked.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Payroll Records

Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), an employer is required to keep payroll records showing the hours worked daily and wages paid to employees. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant failed to maintain payroll records in compliance with this statute.

Labor Code section 1174.5 provides that any employer who fails to maintain accurate payroll records required by section 1174, subdivision (d), “shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).”

Penalties for Unpaid Wages

Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a), and employer who violates “any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty.” (Lab. Code § 558, subd. (a).)

An employer’s initial violation is subject to a “fifty dollar penalty (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages.” *Ibid.* Thereafter, each subsequent violation is subject to a penalty of “one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages.” *Ibid.*

Here, Defendant’s personnel were often required to work more than 8 hours per day to complete work within the timeframes dictated by Defendant. Because Defendant misclassified them, they were not paid their earned overtime. Defendant is therefore liable for civil penalties under section 558, subdivision (a).

Unlawful Failure to Provide Uninterrupted Off-Duty Meal and Rest Periods

Plaintiff and similarly situated employees regularly worked in excess of five hours per day without being provided at least one half-hour meal period in which they were relieved of all duties. (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512; *see also* Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4-2001.) Plaintiff and similarly situated employees also regularly worked in excess of four hours without

being provided at least a ten-minute rest period in which they were relieved of all their duties. (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512; *see also* Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 4-2001.)

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, he was not able to take uninterrupted off-duty meal and rest periods in accordance with Labor Code. Defendant did not maintain a policy that ensured Plaintiff received requisite meal and rest periods until the final months of Plaintiff's employment. Furthermore, Defendant caused Plaintiff to miss meal and rest periods and failed to pay him the premium compensation mandated by Labor Code section 226.7, subdivisions (b)-(c). As a result of these Labor Code violations, Defendant is liable for civil penalties. (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

Conclusion

As described above, Defendant has violated numerous wage and hour provisions of the Labor Code. As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and other current and former employees for civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs, pursuant to Labor Code sections 226, subdivision (a), 226.7, 226.8, subdivision (a), 558, 1182.12, and 2750.3.

This letter shall serve as Plaintiff's notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 and we ask that LWDA conduct an investigation concerning the violations described herein. Alternatively, if LWDA does not intend to investigate these violations, we ask that it issue a notification letter to our office confirming the same so that we may proceed with our civil action asserting the PAGA claims described herein.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or if you would like to discuss this matter further. Nothing in this letter is intended to be, or should be construed as, an admission against the interests of Plaintiff or other current or former employees of Defendant and shall not be construed as a waiver of their rights, remedies, claims, or defenses, all of which are expressly reserved.

Sincerely,



Camron Dowlatshahi