

FILED
3/17/2025 4:59 PM
Clerk of the Napa Superior Court
By: Lori Walker, Deputy

SHIRIAN LAW, P.C.

Joshua Shirian (Cal. Bar No. 341909)

josh@shirianlaw.com

Aaron Yousefzadeh (Cal Bar No. 351101)

aaron@shirianlaw.com

11110 Ohio Avenue, Suite 106

Los Angeles, California 90025

Tel: (310) 907-5000

Fax: (310) 988-5000

Attorneys for Plaintiff, ADRIAN ORTIZ and
on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated
and aggrieved

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

25CV000565

ADRIAN ORTIZ, an individual and on behalf
of all others similarly situated and aggrieved,

Plaintiff,

v.

HARVEST INN TEAM, LLC, a California
limited liability company; and DOES 1
through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.:

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES;
2. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES;
3. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS;
4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS;
5. WAITING TIME PENALTIES;
6. WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS;
7. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES;
8. FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY;
9. UNFAIR COMPETITION; and
10. CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT (2004) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, AND 2699, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

[Amount in Controversy Exceeds \$25,000.00]

1 Plaintiff Adrian Ortiz, on behalf of Plaintiff and all others similarly situated and aggrieved,
2 alleges as follows:

3 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a Class Action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382, against
6 Harvest Inn Team, LLC, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the
7 State of California (“Harvest Inn”); and DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below,
8 (“Defendants”) on behalf of Plaintiff and all other current and former non-exempt California
9 employees employed by or formerly employed by Defendants (“Class Members”).

10 2. This is also a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys
11 General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against Defendants,
12 and any of their respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California, as a
13 proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of California (“LWDA”), on
14 behalf of Plaintiff and all other current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants working
15 within the Civil Penalty Period, as further defined herein, and, as it pertains to the alleged claims
16 for violations of the Labor Code, including but not limited to, failure to comply with Labor Code
17 section 2810.5, Labor Code section 203, Labor Code section 226, Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*,
18 Labor Code section 2802, on behalf of all employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty
19 Period (collectively, “Aggrieved Employees”).

20 **PARTIES**

21 **A. Plaintiff**

22 3. Plaintiff Adrian Ortiz is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times
23 herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants employed
24 Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee, with duties that included, but were not limited to, preparing
25 food for restaurant service, banquet service, and special events. Plaintiff is informed and believes,
26 and based thereon alleges, that Plaintiff Adrian Ortiz worked for Defendants from approximately
27 October of 2019 through approximately April 2024.

28 ///

1 **B. Defendants**

2 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant Harvest
3 Inn is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under
4 and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of Napa, State
5 of California.

6 5. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
7 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,
8 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
9 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated
10 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
11 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of
12 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known. Plaintiff is
13 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent
14 to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or
15 policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the
16 other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to “Defendants,” it shall
17 include Harvest Inn, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the State of
18 California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

19 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

20 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that all the times
21 mentioned herein, each of the Defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
22 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
23 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
24 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

25 7. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
26 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
27 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In
28 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of

1 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
2 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant
3 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
4 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
5 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

6 8. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
7 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

8 JURISDICTION

9 9. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code
10 of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

11 10. Venue is proper in Napa County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
12 sections 392, et seq. because, among other things Napa County is where the causes of action
13 complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the county in
14 which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was
15 due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff
16 and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants, or some of them,
17 reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Class
18 Members in Napa County, and because Defendants employ numerous Class Members in Napa
19 County.

20 11. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
21 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
22 violations set forth herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover, on behalf of himself and all other
23 aggrieved current and former employees of Defendants, the civil penalties provided by PAGA plus
24 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, as the term “civil penalty” is defined under *ZB N.A. v. Superior*
25 *Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175.

26 12. Plaintiff seeks to recover the PAGA civil penalties through a representative action
27 permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v. Superior*
28 *Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the PAGA

1 allegations described herein is not required.

2 13. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding the provision of notice to the
3 LWDA regarding the herein-described Labor Code violations (the “Civil Penalty Period”),
4 Defendants violated, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 256,
5 432, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198.5, 2802, and 2810.3, and 2810.5, among others.

6 14. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes aggrieved employees
7 such as Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved current and former employees within
8 the statutory period, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures
9 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

10 15. On or around June 24, 2024, Plaintiff provided written notice under Labor Code
11 section 2699.3 online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, of Defendants’ violation
12 of various, including the herein-described, provisions of the Labor Code, to the Labor and
13 Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), as well as by certified mail, with return receipt
14 requested to Defendants, and each of them.

15 16. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
16 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants’ alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
17 calendar days of the June 24, 2024 postmarked date of the herein-described notice sent by Plaintiff
18 to the LWDA and Defendants.

19 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

20 17. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
21 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and Class Members, or
22 some of them, in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a result of, without limitation,
23 Plaintiff and Class Members working over eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and
24 seven consecutive work days in a work week without being properly compensated for hours worked
25 in excess of (8) hours per day in a work day, forty (40) hours per week in a work week, and/or hours
26 worked on the seventh consecutive work day in a work week by, among other things, failing to
27 accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked at the proper overtime rate of pay;
28 engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation,

1 by requiring Plaintiff and Class Members: to come early to work and leave late work without being
2 able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Defendants' control due to lines for clocking in, to
3 complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for
4 meal periods and continue working, and to make phone calls off the clock; and editing and/or
5 manipulation of time entries to the detriment of Plaintiff and Class Members. In addition,
6 Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

7 18. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this Action and continuing to the
8 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and Class Members,
9 or some of them, in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a result of, among other
10 things, at times, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked at their regular
11 rate of pay that is above the minimum wage; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work
12 off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Class Members: to come early
13 to work and leave late work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under
14 Defendants' control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in
15 and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to clock
16 out for rest periods, to make phone calls off the clock; and editing and/or manipulation of time
17 entries to show less hours than actually worked, to the detriment of Plaintiff and Class Members. In
18 addition, Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558
19 and 2699.

20 19. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this Action and continuing to the
21 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members, or some of them,
22 full, timely thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal period for days on which they worked more than
23 five (5) hours in a work day and a second thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal period for days on
24 which they worked in excess of ten (10) hours in a work day, and failing to provide compensation
25 for such unprovided meal periods as required by California wage and hour laws. In addition,
26 Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

27 ///

28 ///

1 20. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
2 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and Class Members, or
3 some of them, to take rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major
4 fraction thereof and failed to provide compensation for such unprovided rest periods as required by
5 California wage and hour laws. In addition, Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties
6 pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

7 21. For at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
8 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members, or some of them, the
9 full amount of their wages owed to them upon termination and/or resignation as required by Labor
10 Code sections 201 and 202, including for, without limitation, failing to pay overtime wages,
11 minimum wages and premium wages. In addition, Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties
12 pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

13 22. For at least one (1) year prior to the filing of this Action and continuing to the present,
14 Defendants have, at times, failed to furnish Plaintiff and Class Members, or some of them, with
15 itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages
16 earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
17 hours worked at each hourly rate; and other such information as required by Labor Code section
18 226, subdivision (a). As a result thereof, Defendants have further failed to furnish employees with
19 an accurate calculation of gross and gross wages earned, as well as gross and net wages paid. In
20 addition, Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3,
21 558 and 2699.

22 23. For at least one (1) year prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the present,
23 Defendants have, at times, failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members, or some of them, the full
24 amount of their wages for labor performed in a timely fashion as required under Labor Code section
25 204. In addition, Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections
26 558 and 2699.

27 ///

28 ///

1 24. For at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
2 present, Defendants have, at times, failed to indemnify Class Members, or some of them, for the
3 costs incurred in using cellular phones for work-related purposes and purchasing tools necessary to
4 perform work duties. In addition, Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to
5 Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

6 25. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the
7 present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to provide Plaintiffs and similarly
8 situated employees or former employees within the State of California with the rights provided to
9 them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section
10 245, *et seq.*

11 26. Plaintiff, on their own behalf and on behalf of Class Members, brings this action
12 pursuant to, including but not limited to, Labor Code sections 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7,
13 245, *et seq.*, 510, 512, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 2802, and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section
14 11040, seeking overtime wages, minimum wages, payment of premium wages for missed meal and
15 rest periods, failure to pay timely wages, waiting time penalties, wage statement penalties, failure
16 to indemnify work-related expenses, other such provisions of California law, and reasonable
17 attorneys' fees and costs.

18 27. Plaintiff, on Plaintiff's own behalf and on behalf of Class Members, pursuant to
19 Business and Professions Code sections 17200 through 17208, also seeks (an) injunction(s)
20 prohibiting Defendants from further violating the Labor Code and requiring the establishment of
21 appropriate and effective means to prevent further violations, as well as all monies owed but
22 withheld and retained by Defendants to which Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled, as well as
23 restitution of amounts owed.

24 28. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
25 failing to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft
26 Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
27 Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment;
28 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the

1 name, address, and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information
2 regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants
3 under Labor Code section 2810.5. In addition, Defendants would also be liable for civil penalties
4 pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

5 29. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and
6 other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to
7 California law (including, without limitation Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*), and also did not
8 permit its use upon request as contemplated under California laws, to the detriment of Plaintiff and
9 all other Aggrieved Employees.

10 30. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seek civil penalties under Labor Code
11 sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate the
12 California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
13 Employees pursuant to PAGA.

14 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

15 31. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of Plaintiff and Class Members as a class action
16 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class of all current
17 and former non-exempt employees of Defendants within the State of California at any time
18 commencing four (4) years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's complaint up until the time that notice
19 of the class action is provided to the class (collectively referred to as "Class Members").

20 32. Plaintiff reserves the right under California Rule of Court rule 3.765, subdivision (b)
21 to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity, further divide the defined class
22 into subclasses, and to further specify or limit the issues for which certification is sought.

23 33. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under
24 the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community
25 of interest in the litigation and the proposed Class is easily ascertainable.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **A. Numerosity**

2 34. The potential Class Members as defined are so numerous that joinder of all the
3 members of the Class is impracticable. While the precise number of Class Members has not been
4 determined yet, Plaintiff is informed and believes that there are over seventy-five (75) Class
5 Members employed by Defendants within the State of California.

6 35. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant periods necessarily increases
7 this number. Plaintiff alleges Defendants' employment records would provide information as to the
8 number and location of all Class Members. Joinder of all members of the proposed Class is not
9 practicable.

10 **B. Commonality**

11 36. There are questions of law and fact common to Class Members. These common
12 questions include, but are not limited to:

- 13 A. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 by failing to pay all hours
14 worked at a proper overtime rate of pay?
- 15 B. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and 1197 by failing to pay
16 for all other time worked at the employee's regular rate of pay and a rate of pay that
17 is greater than the applicable minimum wage?
- 18 C. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 512 by not authorizing or permitting
19 Class Members to take compliant meal periods?
- 20 D. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226.7 by not providing Class Members
21 with additional wages for missed or interrupted meal periods?
- 22 E. Did Defendants violate applicable Wage Orders by not authorizing or permitting
23 Class Members to take compliant rest periods?
- 24 F. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226.7 by not providing Class Members
25 with additional wages for missed rest periods?
- 26 G. Did Defendants violate Labor Code sections 201 and 202 by failing to pay Class
27 Members upon termination or resignation all wages earned?

28 ///

- 1 H. Are Defendants liable to Class Members for waiting time penalties under Labor Code
2 section 203?
- 3 I. Did Defendants violate Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by not furnishing
4 Class Members with accurate wage statements?
- 5 J. Did Defendants fail to pay Class Members in a timely fashion as required under
6 Labor Code section 204?
- 7 K. Did Defendants fail to indemnify Class Members for all necessary expenditures or
8 losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or by obedience
9 to the directions of Defendants as required under Labor Code section 2802?
- 10 L. Did Defendants violate the Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code
11 section 17200, *et seq.*, by their unlawful practices as alleged herein?
- 12 M. Are Class Members entitled to restitution of wages under Business and Professions
13 Code section 17203?
- 14 N. Are Class Members entitled to costs and attorneys' fees?
- 15 O. Are Class Members entitled to interest?

16 **C. Typicality**

17 37. The claims of Plaintiff herein alleged are typical of those claims which could be
18 alleged by any Class Members, and the relief sought is typical of the relief which would be sought
19 by each Class Member in separate actions. Plaintiff and Class Members sustained injuries and
20 damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of laws
21 and regulations that have the force and effect of law and statutes as alleged herein.

22 **D. Adequacy of Representation**

23 38. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of Class
24 Members. Counsel who represents Plaintiff is competent and experienced in litigating wage and
25 hour class actions.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

- 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

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

45. Four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Plaintiff and Class Members, at times, worked for Defendants during shifts that consisted of more than eight (8) hours in a workday and/or more than forty hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) consecutive workdays in a workweek, without being paid overtime wages for all hours worked as a result of, including but not limited to, Defendants failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked at the proper overtime rate of pay; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Class Members: to come early to work and leave late work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Defendants' control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, and to make phone calls off the clock; and editing and/or manipulation of time entries, to the detriment of Plaintiff and Class Members.

46. Accordingly, by requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to, at times, work greater than eight (8) hours per workday, forty (40) hours per workweek, and/or seven (7) straight workdays without properly compensating overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay, Defendants, on occasion, willfully violated the provisions of the Labor Code, among others, sections 510, 1194, and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and California law.

47. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and Class Members have been deprived of overtime wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to Labor Code section 1194 and 1199, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay Minimum Wages – Against All Defendants)

48. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

49. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 1197, 1199 and applicable Wage Orders.

///

50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197 and applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Defendants' control.

51. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Defendants failed, at times, to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked at their regular rate of pay that is above the minimum wage; engaged, suffered, or permitted employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Plaintiff and Class Members: to come early to work and leave late work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Defendants' control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, and to make phone calls off the clock; and editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked, to the detriment of Plaintiff and Class Members.

52. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise due.

53. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 218.6, 1194, 1194.2, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of unpaid minimum wages, interest and penalties thereon, liquidated damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Meal Periods – Against All Defendants)

54. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

55. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders.

56. Pursuant to Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders, no employer shall employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a timely meal break of not less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties.

1 Furthermore, no employer shall employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours
2 per day without providing the employee with a second timely meal period of not less than thirty (30)
3 minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties.

4 57. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, if an employer fails to provide an employee
5 with a meal period as provided in the applicable Wage Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
6 the employer shall pay the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate
7 of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.

8 58. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the
9 present, Plaintiff and Class Members were, at times, not provided complete, timely 30-minute, duty-
10 free uninterrupted meal periods every five hours of work without waiving the right to take them, as
11 permitted. Moreover, at times, Defendants failed to provide one (1) additional hour of pay at the
12 Class Member's regular rate of compensation on the occasions that Class Members were not
13 provided compliant meal periods.

14 59. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and Class Members compliant meal periods as
15 contemplated by Labor Code section 512, among other California authorities, and failing, at times,
16 to provide compensation for such unprovided meal periods, as alleged above, Defendants willfully
17 violated the provisions of Labor Code section 512 and applicable Wage Orders.

18 60. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have
19 suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid additional pay
20 owed for missed, untimely, interrupted, incomplete and/or on-duty meal periods.

21 61. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of their unpaid
22 additional pay for unprovided compliant meal periods, in amounts to be determined at trial, plus
23 interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs, under Labor Code sections 226 and 226.7,
24 Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Failure to Provide Rest Periods – Against All Defendants)**

3 62. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
4 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

5 63. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former
6 employees of Defendants covered by applicable Wage Orders.

7 64. California law and applicable Wage Orders require that employers “authorize and
8 permit” employees to take ten (10) minute rest periods in about the middle of each four (4) hour
9 work period “or major fraction thereof.” Accordingly, employees who work shifts of three and-a-
10 half (3 ½) to six (6) hours must be provided ten (10) minutes of paid rest period, employees who
11 work shifts of more than six (6) and up to ten (10) hours must be provided with twenty (20) minutes
12 of paid rest period, and employees who work shifts of more than ten (10) hours must be provided
13 thirty (30) minutes of paid rest period.

14 65. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7, if an employer fails to provide an employee
15 with a meal period or rest period as provided in the applicable Wage Order of the Industrial Welfare
16 Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s
17 regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.

18 66. For four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the
19 present, Plaintiff and Class Members were, at times, not authorized or permitted to take complete,
20 timely 10-minute, duty-free uninterrupted rest periods every four (4) hours of work or major fraction
21 thereof. Moreover, at times, Defendants failed to provide one (1) additional hour of pay at the Class
22 Member’s regular rate of compensation on the occasions that Class Members were not authorized
23 or permitted to take compliant rest periods.

24 67. By their failure, at times, to authorize and permit Plaintiff and Class Members to take
25 rest periods contemplated by California law, and one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s
26 regular rate of compensation for such unprovided rest periods, as alleged above, Defendants
27 willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders.

28 ///

68. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid additional pay owed for rest periods that they were not authorized or permitted to take.

69. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover the full amount of their unpaid additional pay for unprovided compliant rest periods, in amounts to be determined at trial, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs, under Labor Code sections 226 and 226.7, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Termination – Against All Defendants)

70. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

71. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 203, as well as applicable Wage Orders.

72. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 and 202, Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled upon termination to timely payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to termination. Discharged Class Members were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to discharge immediately upon termination. Class Members who resigned were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid prior to resignation within 72 hours after giving notice of resignation or, if they gave 72 hours previous notice, they were entitled to payment of all wages earned and unpaid at the time of resignation.

73. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the three (3) years before the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Defendants, due to the failure, at times, to provide overtime wages mentioned above, failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages earned prior to resignation or termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 or 202.

///

///

74. Plaintiff is informed and believes Defendants' failure, at times, to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages earned prior to termination or resignation in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 was willful. Defendants had the ability to pay all wages earned by Plaintiff and Class Members at the time of termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202, but intentionally adopted policies or practices incompatible with the requirements of Labor Code sections 201 and 202 resulting in the failure, at times, to pay all wages earned prior to termination or resignation.

75. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to waiting time penalties from the date their earned and unpaid wages were due, upon termination or resignation, until paid, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

76. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid for all wages earned prior to termination or resignation.

77. Pursuant to Labor Code section 203 and 218.6, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover waiting time penalties, interest, and their costs of suit, as well.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements – Against All Defendants)

78. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

79. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 226, as well as applicable Wage Orders.

80. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to receive, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized statement that accurately reflects, among other things, gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; among other things.

///

1 81. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the one (1) year
2 before the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Defendants failed to comply
3 with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by adopting policies and practices that resulted in their
4 failure, at times, to furnish Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate itemized statements that
5 accurately reflect, among other things, gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned;
6 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
7 worked at each hourly rate; among other things.

8 82. Defendants' failure to, at times, provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate
9 wage statements was knowing, intentional, and willful. Defendants had the ability to provide
10 Plaintiff and the other Class Members with accurate wage statements, but, at times, willfully
11 provided wage statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

12 83. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have
13 suffered injury. The absence of accurate information on Class Members' wage statements at times
14 has delayed timely challenge to Defendants' unlawful pay practices; requires discovery and
15 mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed; causes difficulty and expense
16 in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records; and led to submission of inaccurate information
17 about wages and amounts deducted from wages to state and federal governmental agencies, among
18 other things.

19 84. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), Plaintiff and Class Members
20 are entitled to recover \$50 for the initial pay period during the period in which violation of Labor
21 Code section 226 occurred and \$100 for each violation of Labor Code section 226 in a subsequent
22 pay period, not to exceed an aggregate \$4,000.00 per employee.

23 85. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 226, subdivisions (e) and (g), Code of Civil
24 Procedure section 1032, Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
25 recover the full amount of penalties due under Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), reasonable
26 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment – Against All Defendants)**

3 86. Plaintiff realleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs and
4 incorporate each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

5 87. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former
6 employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 204 and applicable Wage Orders.

7 88. Labor Code section 204 provides that “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th
8 days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month
9 during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day,
10 inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following
11 month.”

12 89. Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states that “[i]n addition to, and entirely
13 independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay
14 the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, and
15 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars
16 (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful
17 or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25
18 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

19 90. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that in the one (1) year
20 before the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Defendants employed policies
21 and practices that resulted in, at times, not paying Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with
22 Labor Code section 204.

23 91. Pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
24 recover penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code section 204, in the amount of one
25 hundred dollars (\$100) for each initial violation per Class Member, and two hundred dollars (\$200)
26 for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor
27 Code section 204 per Class Member, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

28 ///

92. Pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recovery of penalties, interest, and their costs of suit, as well.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Labor Code § 2802 – Against All Defendants)

93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

94. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees or former employees of Defendants covered by Labor Code section 2802 and applicable Wage Orders.

95. Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (a) provides that “an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties . . .”

96. For three (3) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this Action through the present, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members, or some of them, to incur, at times, necessary expenditures or losses in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or at the obedience to the directions of Defendants that included, without limitation: using cellular phones for work-related purposes and purchasing tools necessary to perform work duties.

97. During that time period, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants failed and refused, and still fail and refuse, at times, to reimburse Plaintiff sand Class Members for those losses and/or expenditures.

98. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered damages in an amount subject to proof, to the extent they were not reimbursed for the herein-described losses and/or expenditures.

99. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2802, Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021.5 and 1032, and Civil Code section 3287, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover reimbursement for their herein-described losses and/or expenditures, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

///

1 **NINETH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Unfair Competition – Against All Defendants)**

3 100. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
4 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

5 101. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the unlawful conduct
6 of Defendants alleged herein constitutes unfair competition within the meaning of Business and
7 Professions Code section 17200. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges
8 that in addition to the unlawful conduct of Defendants alleged in the preceding paragraphs, for at
9 least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the present, Defendants have
10 had a consistent policy of failing to provide Plaintiff and similarly situated employees or former
11 employees within the State of California with the rights provided to them under the Healthy
12 Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.* Due to their
13 unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code, Defendants have gained a competitive
14 advantage over other comparable companies doing business in the State of California that comply
15 with their obligations to compensate employees in accordance with the Labor Code.

16 102. As a result of Defendants' unfair competition as alleged herein, Plaintiff and Class
17 Members have suffered injury in fact and lost money or property.

18 103. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff and Class
19 Members are entitled to (an) injunction(s) prohibiting Defendants from further violating the Labor
20 Code and requiring the establishment of appropriate and effective means to prevent further
21 violations, as well as restitution of all wages and other monies owed to them under the Labor Code,
22 including interest thereon, in which they had a property interest and which Defendants nevertheless
23 failed to pay them and instead withheld and retained for themselves. Restitution of the money owed
24 to Plaintiff and Class Members is necessary to prevent Defendants from becoming unjustly enriched
25 by their failure to comply with the Labor Code.

26 104. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to costs of suit under Code of Civil
27 Procedure section 1032 and interest under Civil Code section 3287.

28 ///

1 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)**

3 105. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in
4 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

5 **Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210**

6 106. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that:
7 “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for
8 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor
9 performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
10 between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

11 107. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated
12 that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this
13 article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3,
14 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
15 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For
16 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for
17 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

18 108. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of
19 failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as
20 per Labor Code section 204. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other
21 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor
22 Code section 204, in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for
23 each initial violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee
24 for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor
25 Code section 204.

26 **Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3**

27 109. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code
28 section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees

1 with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: reflect gross wages earned; total hours
2 worked; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
3 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and other such information as required
4 by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

5 110. Labor Code section 226.3 states that “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
6 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
7 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
8 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
9 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.”

10 111. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that “[t]he civil penalties provided for in
11 his section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.”

12 112. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
13 and have a policy or practice of failing to furnish non-exempt employees, including, without
14 limitation, Plaintiff, itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: reflect gross wages earned;
15 total hours worked; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
16 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; and other such information as
17 required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

18 113. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are
19 entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision
20 (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
21 for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay
22 period for each subsequent violation.

23 Violation of Labor Code § 558

24 114. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other person
25 acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating
26 hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission” shall be subject to a civil
27 penalty as follows:

28 A. For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee and for each

1 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient
2 to recover underpaid wages;

3 B. For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
4 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
5 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

6 C. Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.

7 115. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Defendants, and
8 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections described herein, including
9 causing Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not to: be paid with the rates of pay and overtime
10 rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the
11 regular payday designated by Employer, the name of the employer, including any “doing business
12 as” names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance
13 carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information.

14 116. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
15 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
16 civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
17 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars
18 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

19 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

20 117. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required
21 every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or the
22 employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or
23 employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are
24 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,
25 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,
26 or papers of the person.”

27 ///

28 ///

1 118. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required
2 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of
3 all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

4 119. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
5 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the
6 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
7 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
8 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
9 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
10 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee
11 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units
12 earned.”

13 120. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully
14 fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate
15 and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any
16 member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision
17 (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

18 121. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
19 willfully failed keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar
20 payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment
21 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
22 under Labor Code section 1174.

23 122. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
24 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
25 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
26 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per Aggrieved Employee.

27 ///

28 ///

1 Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

2 123. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other
3 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
4 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
5 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
6 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
7 Section 203 as follows:

8 A. For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100)
9 for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is
10 underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount sufficient to recover
11 underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section 1194.2, and any applicable
12 penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

13 B. For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty dollars
14 (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is
15 underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is intentionally committed. This
16 amount shall be in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages,
17 liquidated damages pursuant to Section 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed
18 pursuant to Section 203.

19 C. Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
20 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
21 employee.”

22 124. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
23 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants, without
24 limitation, routinely failing to pay Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees’ to pay minimum wages
25 for all hours worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to actual and liquidated
26 damages.

27 ///

28 ///

125. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations, pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

126. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

127. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), for all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, the established civil penalty for a violation of those provisions is as follows: if, at the time of the alleged violation, the person employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

128. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described herein, including, without limitation, for the failure to: pay the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Defendants, the name of the employer, including any “doing business as” names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employer under Labor Code section 2810.5, failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws.

1 129. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California
2 whom he seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in
3 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

4 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

5 130. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all causes of action contained herein.

6 **PRAYER**

7 WHEREFORE, on behalf of Plaintiff and Class Members, Plaintiff prays for judgment
8 against Defendants as follows:

- 9 A. An order certifying this case as a Class Action;
- 10 B. An Order appointing Plaintiff as Class representative and appointing Plaintiff's
11 counsel as class counsel;
- 12 C. Damages for all wages earned and owed, including minimum and overtime wages ,
13 under Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197 and 1199;
- 14 D. Liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code section 1194.2;
- 15 E. Damages for unpaid premium wages from missed meal and rest periods under,
16 among other Labor Code sections, 512 and 226.7;
- 17 F. Penalties for inaccurate wage statements under Labor Code section 226,
18 subdivision (e);
- 19 G. Waiting time penalties under Labor Code section 203;
- 20 H. Penalties to timely pay wages under Labor Code section 210;
- 21 I. Damages under Labor Code sections 2802;
- 22 J. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
23 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 24 K. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
25 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 26 L. Preliminary and permanent injunctions prohibiting Defendants from further
27 violating the California Labor Code and requiring the establishment of appropriate
28 and effective means to prevent future violations;

- 1 M. Restitution of wages and benefits due which were acquired by means of any unfair
2 business practice, according to proof;
3 N. Prejudgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed by law;
4 O. For attorneys' fees in prosecuting this action;
5 P. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
6 Q. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

7
8 Dated: March 17, 2025

SHIRIAN LAW, P.C.

9
10 BY: 

11 JOSHUA SHIRIAN,
12 AARON YOUSEFZADEH,
13 Attorneys for Plaintiff ADRIAN ORTIZ on
14 behalf of himself and all others similarly situated
15 and aggrieved
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28