

Molly DeSario, Esq. (SBN 230763)
molly.desario@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90010
 Telephone: (213) 381-9988
 Facsimile: (213) 381-9989
 Attorney for Plaintiff Jessica Roque

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles
10/03/2024

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
 By: R. Lozano Deputy

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

JESSICA ROQUE, individually, and on behalf of
 other members of the general public similarly
 situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

GLOBAL REGENCY SENIOR CARE
 SERVICES, LLC, a California limited liability
 company; GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY
 PALMS COLTON, LP, a California limited
 partnership; GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY
 PALMS INDIO, LP, a California limited
 partnership; GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY
 PALMS OXNARD, LP, a California limited
 partnership; GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY
 PALMS PALMDALE, LP, a California limited
 partnership; GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY
 PALMS, LP, a California limited partnership;
 GLOBAL REGENCY COLTON SENIOR
 CARE SERVICES LLC, a California limited
 liability company; GLOBAL REGENCY FOOD
 SERVICES LLC, a California limited liability
 company; GLOBAL REGENCY MED
 SERVICES LLC, a California limited liability
 company; GLOBAL REGENCY OXNARD
 FOOD SERVICES LLC, a California limited
 liability company; GLOBAL REGENCY
 OXNARD HOME HEALTH CARE SERVICES
 LLC, a California limited liability company;
 GLOBAL REGENCY PALMDALE SENIOR
 CARE SERVICES LLC, a California limited
 liability company; GLOBAL REGENCY
 OXNARD SENIOR CARE SERVICES, LLC, a
 California limited liability company; and DOES
 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STCV17386

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND PAGA
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
5. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Cal. Lab. Code § 226);
6. Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226 and 1198.5);
7. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.); and
8. Civil Penalties Under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 et seq.).

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff JESSICA ROQUE (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary
2 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further
3 investigation and discovery, individually and on behalf of all other members of the public similarly
4 situated, alleges as follows:

5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants GLOBAL REGENCY
7 SENIOR CARE SERVICES, LLC, GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY PALMS COLTON, LP,
8 GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY PALMS INDIO, LP, GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY
9 PALMS OXNARD, LP, GLOBAL PREMIER REGENCY PALMS PALMDALE, LP, GLOBAL
10 PREMIER REGENCY PALMS, LP, GLOBAL REGENCY COLTON SENIOR CARE
11 SERVICES LLC, GLOBAL REGENCY FOOD SERVICES LLC, GLOBAL REGENCY MED
12 SERVICES LLC, GLOBAL REGENCY OXNARD FOOD SERVICES LLC, GLOBAL
13 REGENCY OXNARD HOME HEALTH CARE SERVICES LLC, GLOBAL REGENCY
14 PALMDALE SENIOR CARE SERVICES LLC, GLOBAL REGENCY OXNARD SENIOR
15 CARE SERVICES, LLC, DOES 1 through 20 (collectively, “Defendants”) in Los Angeles
16 County, California, as a nonexempt employee paid hourly from approximately March of 2023 to
17 the present.

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

21 3. Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that each of Defendants, at all times
22 herein mentioned, was:

- 23 (a) A business entity qualified to do business and actually conducting business
24 in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Los
25 Angeles County; and,
26 (b) The former employer of Plaintiff and the current and/or former employer of
27 the putative Class because Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and
28 the Class to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working

conditions.

4. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Class. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior.”

5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-20, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiff and the Class as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

6. At all times mentioned herein, Does 1-20, 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.

7. Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, 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 alleges, on information and belief, 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.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter because Plaintiff brings this Complaint for various violations of the California Labor Code (including a claim pursuant to the Private Attorney General Act of 2004) and California Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) orders, Defendants are California entities, and Plaintiff is a California resident.

9. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the County of Los Angeles, California.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

10. Plaintiff worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee paid hourly. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiff regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

11. On April, 2024, Plaintiff sent a written request through their counsel to Defendants for their personnel file, pay records, wage statements, timekeeping records, and other employment-related documents pursuant to Labor Code section 226 and 1198.5. However, Defendants failed to timely produce all of the requested employment records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5, by failing to produce wage statements and all documents signed by Plaintiff as of the date of this Complaint.

12. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants for California Labor Code violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to furnish accurate wage statements, and failure to produce requested employment records. As discussed below, Plaintiff’s experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative of the class.

13. Plaintiff brings the First through Seventh Causes of Action individually and as a class action on behalf of himself and certain current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members,” and defined more fully below). The Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any

Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

14. Plaintiff brings the Eighth Cause of Action as a representative action under the Labor Code Private Attorneys Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698 et seq. (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt employees employed by Defendants in the State of California during the statute of limitations period for their PAGA claim (herein after referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

15. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the IWC, and the California Business & Professions Code.

16. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed to comply with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders with respect to Plaintiff and the Class and instead maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of including, but not limited to, the following violations on a regular basis:

- (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum, straight time, and overtime wages; for example, Defendants:
 - 1) required them to continue working during unpaid meal periods; and/or
 - 2) failed to pay for all hours worked and failed to pay some of this unpaid work at the overtime rate, as required; and/or
 - 3) failed to maintain accurate records of the hours worked.
- (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods; for example, Defendants:
 - 1) required employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work; and/or

- 2) failed to compensating employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work;
 - 3) continued to assert control over employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods; and/or
 - 4) denied employees permission to take a meal period;
 - 5) enacting noncompliant meal and rest break policies; and/or
 - 6) failed to maintain accurate records of and falsified records of meal periods taken or missed; and/or
 - 7) wrote employees up when they tried to stay clocked in during times they were unable to take timely and uninterrupted meal breaks and altered time records to appear as if compliant meal breaks were taken.
- (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods; for example, Defendants:
- 1) required employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours); and/or
 - 2) failed to compensate employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted; and/or
 - 3) continued to assert control over employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods; and/or
 - 4) denied employees permission to take a rest period; and/or
 - 5) understaffed the facility with such a high patient to caregiver ratio that employees had no time for any breaks.

(d) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, such as accrued paid sick leave, legal employing entity name; all applicable hourly rates, all overtime hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, meal and rest periods penalties, among other things;

(e) Failing to timely produce requested employment records as required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order;

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

18. As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Class suffered injury because, among other things:

(a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they were entitled;

(b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;

(c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were entitled;

(d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;

(e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium

wages 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 to 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.

19. Thus, Plaintiff and the Class are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e) and injunctive relief under California Labor Code § 226(h).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

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

21. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

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

All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years and 178 days before the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class is sent.¹

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

¹ In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California adopted Emergency Rule 9(a) (California Rules of Court), whereby “statutes of limitations and repose for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 to October 1, 2020.”

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

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

- (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the Class is estimated to be greater than forty (40) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.
- (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.
- (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly, and adequately protect the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.
- (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:
 - 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;

- 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and,
- 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

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

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

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages, as well as on-call/standby pay;
- (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
- (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to Class Members;
- (d) Failed to provide Class Members with accurate wage statements;
- (e) Unlawfully deducted from Class Members' wages; and
- (f) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq. as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

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

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

the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the class as a whole.

28. Plaintiff contemplates the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of 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 contemplates 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

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages for All Hours Worked)

29. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

30. "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.

31. 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 California Labor Code § 1194, and any additional applicable Wage Orders that require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

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

33. 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.

34. 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 and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

37. California Labor Code § 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 and straight time 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.

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

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

39. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

40. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight 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.

41. 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 IWC is unlawful.

42. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as employees of Defendants.

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

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

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

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

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

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)

48. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

49. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiff and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the

1 start of Plaintiff's and the Class's sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal
2 periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. California Labor Code
3 § 512, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal
4 periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of
5 California Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal
6 period mandated under any Wage Order.

7 50. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff
8 and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and
9 authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that
10 Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),
11 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable
12 Wage Orders.

13 51. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
14 additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s),
15 plus interest thereon.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)**

18 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above
19 paragraphs.

20 53. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten
21 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than
22 two hours). California Labor Code § 512, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer
23 permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten minutes each for each 4-hour
24 period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the
25 employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks, as required, is itself
26 a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for
27 an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage
28 Order.

54. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than four hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

55. Under California law, 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 rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)

56. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

57. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of their or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of their or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

58. In addition, California Labor Code § 246(i) required employer to provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage

1 statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date
2 with the employee's payment of wages. If an employer provides unlimited paid sick leave or
3 unlimited paid time off to an employee, the employer may satisfy this section by indicating on the
4 notice or the employee's itemized wage statement "unlimited."

5 59. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
6 complete and accurate wage statements compliant with these Labor Code sections. The
7 deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned
8 by Plaintiff and the Class, the failure to list the true "total hours worked by the employee," and the
9 failure to list the true net wages earned.

10 60. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 246(i),
11 Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

12 61. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by
13 Defendants' intentional violations of California §§ 226(a) and 246(i) because they were denied
14 both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage
15 statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

16 62. 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
18 a 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 California's Labor Code and related
20 laws and regulations.

21 63. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their
22 actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code §§ 226(a)
23 and 246(i), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

24 64. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of
25 attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code
26 § 226(h).

27 ///

28 ///

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants by All Plaintiffs for Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records)

65. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

66. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, current and former employees have the right to inspect or receive a copy of their records pertaining to their employment, upon reasonable request to their employer. Under this statute, an employer that receives a request to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former employee must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date of the request.

67. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5(a), every current and former employee, or their or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any grievance concerning the employee. Under this statute, upon written request from a current or former employee or their or her representative, an employer must make the contents of those personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the current or former employee, or their or her representative, not later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions. Failure to comply with these requests allows for a civil penalty seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750), pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1198.5(k) and 226(f).

68. As set forth above, Plaintiff and the Class are current and former employees of Defendants.

69. As set forth above, Plaintiff sent a written request through their counsel to Defendants for their payroll records, timecards, and personnel records. However, Plaintiff has not received all of the requested records as of the date of this Complaint.

70. Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 by failing to timely produce the required records requested by Plaintiff.

71. On information and belief, Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with their requested employment records is not an isolated incident, but was instead consistent with Defendants' policy and practice that applied to Plaintiffs and the Class.

72. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1198.5, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to a penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750) from Defendants, injunctive relief in the form of compliance with section 1198.5, and attorneys' fees and costs.

73. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff is entitled to a penalty of seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750) from Defendants, injunctive relief in the form of compliance with section 226, and attorneys' fees and cost.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

75. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

76. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

77. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

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

& Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages

79. Defendants' failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

80. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

81. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

82. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

83. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

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

85. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

86. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled

1 to, and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
2 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived, by
3 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and
4 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
5 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

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

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

18 89. Plaintiff also alleges that, if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
19 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance, and other
20 withholdings.

21 90. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and
22 putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
23 Defendants during a period that commences four years and 178 days prior to the filing of this
24 complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to
25 Plaintiff and Class Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil
26 Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

27 ///

28 ///

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**(By Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys
General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698, et seq.)**

91. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and reallege, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

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

93. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this 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 Section 2699.3.”

94. On June 20, 2024, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee. On July 10, 2024, Plaintiff amended the notice. Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1035412-24 (Jessica Guadalupe Roque v. Global Regency Senior Care Services, LLC). Sixty-five days have passed and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Plaintiff hereby commences a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

95. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and similarly situated Aggrieved

Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

CLASS CERTIFICATION

1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to all of its causes of action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and,
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

AS TO THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

10. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all

overtime wages due;

11. For unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;

12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,

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 California 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 California 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 the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

26. For all actual damages, according to proof;

27. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

28. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

29. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

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

AS TO THE SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

31. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the records producing provisions of California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide the required and requested documents thereto;

32. For all actual damages, according to proof;

33. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5;

34. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

35. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and,

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

AS TO THE SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

37. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to indemnify employees for expenditures, and unlawful deductions from wages.

38. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

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

41. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.; and,

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

AS TO THE EIGHT CAUSE OF ACTION

43. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay for all hours worked (minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay final wages, failure to furnish accurate wage statements, and failure to indemnify employees for expenditures;

44. An award of civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the State of California, and all similarly aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA;

45. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;

46. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;

47. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and,

AS TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

48. For a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury;

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

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 2, 2024

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

By: *m. desario*
Molly DeSario, Esq.
Attorney for Plaintiff

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, **Manuel Martinez**, state that I am employed in the aforesaid County, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010.

On **October 3, 2024**, I served the foregoing document on the interested parties as addressed below and via one of the methods of service set forth below:

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

Michael J. Ryan
STEARNS & RYAN
11777 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 555
Los Angeles, CA 90049
Telephone: (310) 424-1424
Email: mryan@stearnsandryan.com; jwakefield@stearnsandryan.com

Attorney for Defendants

(By Mail) I declare that I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

[X] (By E-mail or Electronic Transmission) Based on Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(g), a court order, or an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

(By Overnight Mail) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for overnight delivery of documents. Under that practice it would be delivered to an authorized agent or driver of an overnight mail carrier with the fees paid or provided for on the date of service and delivered the next day.

(By Personal Service) I caused such envelope to be hand-delivered to the above address.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 3, 2024, at Los Angeles California.


Manuel Martinez