

08/23/2024

By: A. Turner Deputy

D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
David Keledjian (SBN 309135)
d.keledjian@d.law
David Arakelyan (SBN 337076)
d.arakelyan@d.law
880 E. Broadway
Glendale, CA 91205
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff ALANAH LONGMIRE

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

ALANAH LONGMIRE, on behalf of herself
and all others similarly situated, and the
general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS – SACRAMENTO,
LLC, a Nevada corporation; DEJA VU
SERVICES, INC., a Michigan corporation;
DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS, an entity of
unknown form; HARRY MOHNEY, an
individual; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24CV012399

Amended As a Matter of Right Pursuant to
Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(C)

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198);
3. Failure to Pay Hourly Wages and Overtime (Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198);
4. Failure to Provide Accurate Written Wage Statements (Lab. Code §§ 226(a));
5. Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203);
6. Failure to Indemnify (Lab. Code § 2802);
7. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*); and
8. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff ALANAH LONGMIRE (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself, all others similarly
2 situated, the State of California, and the general public, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action against Defendant DEJA VU
5 SHOWGIRLS – SACRAMENTO, LLC, a Nevada corporation; DEJA VU SERVICES, INC., a
6 Michigan corporation; DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS, an entity of unknown form; HARRY MOHNEY, an
7 individual; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for alleged
8 violations of the California Labor Code and California Business and Professions Code. As set forth
9 below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have:

- 10 a. failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;
- 11 b. failed to pay them double time wages at the correct rate;
- 12 c. failed to pay them overtime and/or double time wages by failing to include all
13 applicable remuneration in calculating the regular rate of pay;
- 14 d. failed to provide them with meal periods;
- 15 e. failed to provide them with rest periods;
- 16 f. failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and rest periods;
- 17 g. failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements;
- 18 h. failed to reimburse them with necessary business expenditures; and
- 19 i. failed to pay them all their final wages following separation of employment.

20 Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class and
21 representative action to recover unpaid wages, liquidated damages, civil and statutory penalties,
22 restitution, and related relief on behalf of himself, all others similarly situated, and the general public.

23 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

24 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the monetary
25 damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff from Defendants’ conduct exceeds the minimal
26 jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.

27 3. Venue is proper in the County of Sacramento pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
28 sections 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose in this county because at least some of the transactions

1 that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found,
2 maintains offices, transacts business and/or has an agent therein.

3 4. Venue is proper in Sacramento County because Defendants' have at all times alleged
4 herein, conducted business in Sacramento County, and throughout California. As such, venue is
5 proper in any county in California.

6 **PARTIES**

7 5. Plaintiff ALANAH LONGMIRE is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, an
8 individual residing in the State of California.

9 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant DEJA VU
10 SHOWGIRLS – SACRAMENTO, LLC, is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a Nevada
11 corporation doing business in the State of California.

12 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant DEJA VU
13 SERVICES, INC., is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a Michigan corporation doing
14 business in the State of California.

15 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant DEJA VU
16 SHOWGIRLS, an entity of unknown form, is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, doing
17 business in the State of California.

18 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant HARRY
19 MOHNEY is and at all relevant times mentioned herein remains, an individual residing in the State
20 of California.

21 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendant HARRY
22 MOHNEY, at all times relevant to this Complaint, were the alter egos of DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS –
23 SACRAMENTO, LLC; DEJA VU SERVICES, INC.; DEJA VU SHOWGIRLS, (collectively, the
24 “Companies”). Plaintiff alleges, upon information and belief, that HARRY MOHNEY, either
25 individually or with members of their family, owned, controlled, and dominated the Companies; that
26 they comingled the funds of the Companies with their personal assets, as well as the assets of other
27 entities owned in whole or in part by them; that they failed to segregate the funds of these separate
28 entities; that they wrongly diverted corporate funds or assets to non-corporate uses; that they treated

1 the assets of the Companies as their own; that they held themselves out as being personally liable for
2 the debts of the Companies; that they failed to maintain minutes or adequate corporate records and
3 confused the records of various entitles; that they used the same office or business location and
4 employed the same employees and attorneys for all entitles; that they failed to adequately capitalize
5 the Companies; that they used the Companies as a mere shell, instrumentality, or conduit for the
6 business of an individual or individuals, namely, themselves and their families; that they disregarded
7 legal formalities and failed to maintain arm's-length relationships among related entities; that they
8 used the corporate entity to procure labor, services, and merchandise for themselves or other entities;
9 that they diverted assets from the Companies to the detriment of creditors, or manipulated assets and
10 liabilities between entities so as to concentrate the assets in one and the liabilities in another; that they
11 used the Companies as subterfuges of illegal transactions; and that they formed and used the
12 Companies to transfer to it their existing liabilities. Plaintiff further avers that recognizing the acts
13 and conduct described in this Complaint as those only of the Companies would promote an inequitable
14 and unjust result, namely, the deprivation of Plaintiff's fundamental rights under the Labor Code, as
15 described herein.

16 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes that HARRY MOHNEY, is a natural person who is
17 the owner, director, officer, or managing agent of the Companies, who violated, or caused to be
18 violated, the Labor Code Sections alleged herein, and are liable under Labor Code § 558.1.

19 12. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as
20 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff
21 will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when
22 ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that each of the fictitiously
23 named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged
24 herein and that Plaintiff's alleged damages were proximately caused by these defendants, and each of
25 them. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege both the true names and capacities of the DOE
26 defendants when ascertained.

27 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
28 mentioned herein, some or all of the defendants were the representatives, agents, employees, partners,

1 directors, associates, joint venturers, joint employers, owners, principals or co-participants of some
2 or all of the other defendants, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting within the course
3 and scope of such relationship and with the full knowledge, consent, and ratification by such other
4 defendants.

5 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
6 mentioned herein, some of the defendants pursued a common course of conduct, acted in concert and
7 conspired with one another, and aided and abetted one another to accomplish the occurrences, acts
8 and omissions alleged herein.

9 15. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Code
10 of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest among the
11 persons who comprise the readily ascertainable classes defined below and because Plaintiff is
12 unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in managing this case as a class action.

13 16. **Relevant Time Period:** The relevant time period is defined as the time period
14 beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until judgment is entered.

- 15 a. **Hourly Employee Class:** All persons employed by Defendants, collectively or
16 separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in hourly or
17 non-exempt positions in California four years prior to the filing of this action and
18 ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action (“Hourly Employee
19 Class”).
- 20 b. **Meal Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked in
21 a shift in excess of five hours during the four years prior to the filing of this action
22 and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 23 c. **Rest Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked a
24 shift of at least three and one-half (3.5) hours the four years prior to the filing of
25 this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 26 d. **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
27 separated from their employment with Defendants during the period beginning
28 three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is
entered.
- e. **Wage Statement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California during
the period beginning one year before the filing of this action and ending when final
judgment is entered.
- f. **Expense Reimbursement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in
California who incurred business expenses during the **Relevant Time Period**.
- g. **UCL Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** and **Expense Reimbursement Class**

1 members employed by Defendants in California during the four years prior to the
2 filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
action.

3 17. **Reservation of Rights:** Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the right
4 to amend or modify the class definitions with greater specificity, by further division into sub-classes
5 and/or by limitation to particular issues.

6 18. **Numerosity:** The class members are so numerous that the individual joinder of each
7 individual class member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact number of
8 class members, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that the actual number
9 exceeds the minimum required for numerosity under California law.

10 19. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all
11 class members and predominate over any questions which affect only individual class members.
12 These common questions include, but are not limited to:

- 13 a. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
14 employees with their rest periods;
- 15 b. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
16 employees with their meal periods;
- 17 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members when they
18 have not been provided with meal and rest periods at the appropriate rates of pay;
- 19 d. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class
20 members for all time worked;
- 21 e. Whether Defendants failed to provide class members with accurate written wage
22 statements as a result of providing them with written wage statements with
23 inaccurate entries for, among other things, amounts of gross and net wages, and
24 total hours worked;
- 25 f. Whether Defendants applied policies or practices that result in late and/or
26 incomplete final wage payments;
- 27 g. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse class members for all necessary business
28 expenses incurred during the discharge of their duties;

1 h. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under
2 Labor Code section 203; and

3 i. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that
4 Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition;

5 20. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other class members' claims. Plaintiff
6 is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants have a policy or practice of failing
7 to comply with the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code as alleged in this
8 Complaint.

9 21. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative and
10 has no interests that are adverse to, or otherwise conflict with, the interests of absent class members
11 and is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on their behalf. Plaintiff will fairly and
12 adequately represent and protect the interests of the other class members.

13 22. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that
14 they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent class members, are experienced in
15 wage and hour class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf
16 of Plaintiff and absent class members.

17 23. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and
18 efficient adjudication of the class members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the
19 Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to simultaneously and
20 efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the unnecessary duplication of
21 effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the monetary amounts
22 due to many individual class members are likely to be relatively small and would thus make it
23 difficult, if not impossible, for individual class members to both seek and obtain relief. Moreover, a
24 class action will serve an important public interest by permitting class members to effectively pursue
25 the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will prevent the potential for inconsistent
26 or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

27 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

28 24. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a non-exempt employee during the relevant and

1 statutory periods.

2 25. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff
3 and Class Members proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.
4 Plaintiff and Class Members were also consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which
5 they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were systemically required to
6 show up to work an hour before their shift started to get ready including getting dressed for the job,
7 doing their costumes, styling hair, and applying make-up. Additionally, time was required to doffing
8 their clothing, hair and makeup at the end of their shift. Furthermore, when Plaintiff and Class
9 Members would show up to work, the doors of the building would be locked and sometimes they
10 would have to wait an upwards of 15 minutes for someone to open the door for them. Finally, there
11 would be a wait of 5 minutes to use the clock timer at the start and the end of their shifts. The forgoing
12 and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no
13 wages were paid.

14 26. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of
15 eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Plaintiff
16 and Class Members to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

17 27. Defendants also failed to Plaintiff and Class Members overtime wages at the proper
18 and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members earned performance-
19 based non-discretionary bonuses in addition to their hourly pay. However, these supplemental
20 earnings were not accounted for when determining Plaintiff and Class Members' regular rates of pay,
21 and respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

22 28. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
23 Class Members the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law.
24 Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were never provided a meal break. Furthermore, Plaintiff
25 and Class Members were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required
26 to keep working during meal breaks.

27 29. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30)
28 minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal

1 period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to
2 take their meal periods, or that advised Class Members of their meal and rest period rights; and (3)
3 Defendants' practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their meal and
4 rest periods due to the excessive workload.

5 30. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
6 Class Members the opportunity to take rest periods in compliance with the California Law. Plaintiff
7 and Class Members were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4)
8 hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest
9 period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2)
10 no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods,
11 or that properly advised Plaintiff and Class Members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy
12 and practice of requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to remain on the premises during their rest
13 breaks; and (4) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue
14 working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload.

15 31. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members premium pay
16 wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

17 32. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as "gross wages
18 earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

19 33. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as "total hours worked
20 by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were
21 not included.

22 34. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as "net wages earned"
23 were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

24 35. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as "all applicable
25 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
26 hourly rate by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including
27 overtime, were not included.

28 36. Plaintiff and Class Members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in

1 executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were
2 required to pay the costs of lingerie, make-up, manicure/pedicures, specific shoes for the stage on
3 which they danced on, pole grips, and money collecting bags.

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

6 **(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1174, and 1198)**

7 **(Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class)**

8 37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if
9 fully alleged herein.

10 38. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members have been
11 non-exempt employees of Defendant entitled to the full meal period protections of both the Labor
12 Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

13 39. Labor Code section 512 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare
14 Commission Wage Order impose an affirmative obligation on employers to provide non-exempt
15 employees with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period
16 of five hours, and to provide them with two uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty
17 minutes for each work period of ten hours.

18 40. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare
19 Commission Wage Order ("Wage Order") both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work
20 during required meal periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of
21 premium wages on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required meal period.

22 41. Compensation for missed meal periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor
23 Code section 200.

24 42. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that
25 violate the applicable Wage Order.

26 43. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:

27 No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than
28 five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except
that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete

1 the day's work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of
2 the employer and employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty
3 during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an
4 'on duty' meal period and counted as time worked. An 'on duty' meal
5 period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written
agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed
to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing,
revoke the agreement at any time.

6 44. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was not subject to a valid on-duty meal period
7 agreement. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, **Meal Period Sub-Class**
8 members were not subject to valid on-duty meal period agreements with Defendants.

9 45. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
10 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
11 **Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5)
12 hour work period, as required by Labor Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order.
13 Specifically, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** Members were never provided a meal break.
14 Furthermore, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** Members were not relieved of all work duties
15 during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep working during meal breaks.

16 46. Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** Members were not provided with meal periods
17 of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not
18 scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that
19 encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised **Meal Period Sub-Class** Members
20 of their meal and rest period rights; and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring putative class members
21 to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

22 47. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
23 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to pay premium wages to **Meal Period Sub-**
24 **Class** members when they worked five (5) hours without clocking out for any meal period.

25 48. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
26 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
27 **Sub-Class** with a second meal period when they worked shifts of ten (10) or more hours and failed
28 to pay them premium wages as required by Labor Code 512 and the applicable Wage Order.

49. Moreover, Defendants written policies fail to inform Meal period Class Members of their meal period rights under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

50. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** Members additional premium wages, and/or were not paid premium wages at the employees' regular rates of pay when required meal periods were not provided.

51. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6, 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** Members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and costs of suit.

52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class Members**, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS

(Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198)

(Plaintiff and Rest Period Sub-Class)

53. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

54. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class** members have been non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full rest period protections of both the Labor Code and the applicable Wage Order.

55. Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order imposes an affirmative obligation on employers to permit and authorize employees to take required rest periods at a rate of no less than ten (10) minutes of net rest time for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, that must be in the middle of each work period insofar as practicable.

56. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work during required rest periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of premium wages at the employees' regular rates of pay, on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required rest period(s).

1 57. Compensation for missed rest periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor
2 Code section 200.

3 58. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that
4 violate the Wage Order.

5 59. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
6 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing members of the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
7 with net rest period of at least ten (10) uninterrupted minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or
8 major fraction thereof, as required by the applicable Wage Order.

9 60. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
10 **Rest Period Sub-Class** Members the opportunity to take rest periods in compliance with the
11 California Law. Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** Members were not provided with rest periods
12 of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1)
13 Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second
14 rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that
15 encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Plaintiff and **Rest Period**
16 **Sub-Class** Members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring
17 Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** Members to remain on the premises during their rest breaks;
18 and (4) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue working
19 through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload.

20 61. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** Members
21 premium pay wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

22 62. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
23 members additional premium wages when required rest periods were not provided.

24 63. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself
25 and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and
26 costs of suit.

27 64. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
28 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Rest**

1 **Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

2 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **FAILURE TO PAY HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES**

4 **(Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1197 and 1198)**

5 **(Plaintiff and Hourly Employee Class)**

6 65. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
7 herein.

8 66. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members are or have been
9 non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full protections of the Labor Code and the
10 applicable Wage Order.

11 67. Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during
12 which an employee is subject to the control of the employer, and includes all the time the employee
13 is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so."

14 68. Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt
15 employees at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consist of all hours
16 that an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

17 69. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
18 employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under the applicable Wage
19 Order.

20 70. Labor Code section 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover liquidated
21 damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon in addition
22 to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon.

23 71. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less
24 than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a
25 payroll period.

26 72. Labor Code section 1197.1 provides that it is unlawful for any employer or any other
27 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent or employee of another person, to pay an
28 employee, or cause an employee to be paid, less than the applicable minimum wage.

1 73. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ employees under
2 conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

3 74. Labor Code section 204 requires employers to pay non-exempt employees their earned
4 wages for the normal work period at least twice during each calendar month on days the employer
5 designates in advance and to pay non-exempt employees their earned wages for labor performed in
6 excess of the normal work period by no later than the next regular payday.

7 75. Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for employers to pay their employees lower
8 wages than required by contract or statute while purporting to pay them legal wages.

9 76. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order require employees
10 to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than one and one-half (1.5) times their
11 respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, all
12 hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and/or for the first eight (8) hours
13 worked on the seventh consecutive day of one workweek.

14 77. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order also require
15 employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than two (2) times their respective
16 regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for all
17 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on a seventh consecutive workday during the workweek.

18 78. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, Defendants have applied
19 centrally devised policies and practices to him and **Hourly Employee Class** members with respect to
20 working conditions and compensation arrangements.

21 79. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay hourly wages to Plaintiff and **Hourly**
22 **Employee Class** members for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime hours at
23 statutory and/or agreed rates.

24 80. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were not paid proper wages and
25 overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
26 Members were also consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not
27 paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** Members were systemically required
28 to show up to work an hour before their shift started to get ready including getting dressed for the job,

1 doing their costumes, styling hair, and applying make-up. Additionally, time was required to doffing
2 their clothing, hair and makeup at the end of their shift. Furthermore, when Plaintiff and **Hourly**
3 **Employee Class** Members would show up to work, the doors of the building would be locked and
4 sometimes they would have to wait an upwards of 15 minutes for someone to open the door for them.
5 Finally, there would be a wait of 5 minutes to use the clock timer at the start and the end of their
6 shifts. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of
7 Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

8 81. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were consistently required to perform
9 work, off-the-clock for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
10 **Class** members were systemically required to attend weekly training sessions, for which no wages
11 were paid. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to work
12 in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling
13 Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** Members to minimum and overtime wages, which they were
14 systemically denied.

15 82. Defendants also failed to Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members overtime
16 wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
17 **Class** Members earned performance-based non-discretionary bonuses in addition to their hourly pay.
18 However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted for when determining Plaintiff and **Hourly**
19 **Employee Class** Members' regular rates of pay, and respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

20 83. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
21 members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid the
22 full amount of wages earned during each pay period during the applicable limitations period,
23 including overtime wages.

24 84. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 218.6, 223, 510, 1194 and 1194.2, Plaintiff, on
25 behalf of herself and **Hourly Employee Class** Members, seeks to recover unpaid straight time and
26 overtime wages, interest thereon and costs of suit.

27 85. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
28 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and

Hourly Employee Class Members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS

(Lab. Code § 226)

(Plaintiff and Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class)

86. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

87. Labor Code section 226(a) states:

An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (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 only the last four digits of his 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, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of 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 and, beginning July 1, 2013, if the employer is a temporary services employer as defined in Section 201.3, the rate of pay and the total hours worked for each temporary services assignment. The deductions made from payment of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement and the record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California. For purposes of this subdivision, 'copy' includes a duplicate of the itemized statement provided to an employee or a computer-generated record that accurately shows all of the information required by this subdivision.

88. The Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("DLSE") has sought to harmonize the "detachable part of the check" provision and the "accurate itemized statement in writing" provision of Labor Code section 226(a) by allowing for electronic wage statements so long as each employee retains the right to elect to receive a written paper stub or record and that those who are provided with

1 electronic wage statements retain the ability to easily access the information and convert the electronic
2 statements into hard copies at no expense to the employee. (DLSE Opinion Letter July 6, 2006).

3 89. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
4 limitations period, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members
5 with written wage statements as described above. Additionally, the wage statements issued to class
6 members failed to account for the unpaid minimum wages, overtime, and premium pay wages
7 described above.

8 90. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as “gross wages
9 earned” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

10 91. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as “total hours worked
11 by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were
12 not included.

13 92. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as “net wages earned”
14 were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

15 93. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(8) as the wage statements
16 issues to Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** Members failed to state “the name and address of the
17 legal entity that is the employer.”

18 94. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as “all applicable
19 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
20 hourly rate by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including
21 overtime, were not included.

22 95. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants’ failure to provide Plaintiff and
23 **Wage Statement Class** members with accurate written wage statements was intentional in that
24 Defendants have the ability to provide them with accurate wage statements but have intentionally
25 provided them with written wage statements that Defendants have known do not comply with Labor
26 Code section 226(a).

27 96. Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** Members have suffered injuries, in that
28 Defendants have violated their legal rights to receive accurate wage statements and have misled them

1 about their actual rates of pay and wages earned. In addition, inaccurate information on their wage
2 statements has prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required
3 discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed, has caused
4 difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records, and/or has led to the
5 submission of inaccurate information about wages and deductions to federal and state government
6 agencies.

7 97. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226(e), Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Wage**
8 **Statement Class** Members, seeks the greater of actual damages or \$50.00 for the initial pay period
9 in which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, and \$100.00 for each subsequent pay
10 period in which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, not to exceed an aggregate penalty
11 of \$4000.00 per class member, as well as awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

12 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL FINAL WAGES**

14 **(Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**

15 **(Plaintiff and Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class)**

16 98. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
17 herein.

18 99. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members have
19 been entitled, upon the end of their employment with Defendants, to timely payment of all wages
20 earned and unpaid before termination or resignation.

21 100. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 201, employees who have been
22 discharged have been entitled to payment of all final wages immediately upon termination.

23 101. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 202, employees who have
24 resigned after giving at least seventy-two (72) hours' notice of resignation have been entitled to
25 payment of all final wages at the time of resignation.

26 102. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
27 limitations period, Defendants have failed to timely pay **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class**
28 Members all their final wages in accordance with the Labor Code.

103. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants have maintained a policy or practice of paying **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members their final wages without regard to the requirements of Labor Code sections 201 or 202 by failing to timely pay them all final wages.

104. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants' failure to timely pay all final wages to him and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members has been willful in that Defendants have the ability to pay final wages in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and/or 202 but have intentionally adopted policies or practices that are incompatible with those requirements.

105. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 203 and 218.6, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** Members, seeks waiting time penalties from the dates that their final wages have first become due until paid, up to a maximum of thirty days, and interest thereon.

106. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** Members, seeks awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY

(Lab. Code § 2802)

(Plaintiff and Reimbursement Class)

107. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

108. Labor Code section 2802(a) states:

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, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful.

109. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** Members were required to pay the costs of lingerie, make-up,

1 manicure/pedicures, specific shoes for the stage on which they danced on, pole grips, and money
2 collecting bags.

3 110. Accordingly, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** Members are entitled to
4 restitution for all unpaid amounts due and owing to within four (4) years of the date of the filing of
5 the Complaint and until the date of entry of judgment.

6 111. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, and **Expense Reimbursement Class** Members, seeks
7 interest thereon and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees and
8 costs pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

9 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

11 **(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*)**

12 **(Plaintiff and UCL Class)**

13 112. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
14 herein.

15 113. Business and Professions Code section 17200 defines "unfair competition" to include
16 any unlawful business practice.

17 114. Business and Professions Code sections 17203-17204 allow a person who has lost
18 money or property as a result of unfair competition to bring a class action in accordance with Code
19 of Civil Procedure section 382 to recover money or property that may have been acquired from
20 similarly situated persons by means of unfair competition.

21 115. California law requires employers to pay hourly, non-exempt employees for all hours
22 they are permitted or suffered to work, including hours that the employer knows or reasonable should
23 know that employees have worked.

24 116. Plaintiff and the **UCL Class** Members re-allege and incorporate the FIRST, SECOND,
25 THIRD, AND SIXTH causes of action herein.

26 117. Plaintiff lost money or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair competition.

27 118. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair competition.

28 119. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that by committing the Labor

1 Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 215, 216, 225,
2 226.6, 226.7, 354, 408, 512, 510, 553, 1175, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2802
3 as well as applicable Wage Orders, which make it a misdemeanor to commit the violations alleged
4 herein.

5 120. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and practices of,
6 *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an employer to: provide non-exempt
7 employees with compliant meal and rest periods; pay for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay;
8 and reimbursement for necessary business expenditures.

9 121. Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged in this Complaint amounts to and constitutes
10 unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*
11 Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* protects against unfair competition and allows
12 a person who has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property as a result of an unfair,
13 unlawful or fraudulent business practice to seek restitution on his own behalf and on behalf of
14 similarly situated persons in a class action proceeding.

15 122. As a result of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code during the applicable
16 limitations period, Plaintiff has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property in the form
17 of earned wages. Specifically, Plaintiff has lost money or property as a result of Defendants' conduct.

18 123. Plaintiff is informed and believes that other similarly situated persons have been
19 subject to the same unlawful policies or practices of Defendants.

20 124. Due to the unfair and unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code,
21 Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in
22 the State of California that comply with their legal obligations.

23 125. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") permits civil recovery and injunctive
24 relief for "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice," including if a practice or act
25 violates or is considered unlawful under any other state or federal law.

26 126. Accordingly, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 17203,
27 Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
28 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor

1 Code and applicable Wage Orders.

2 127. Accordingly, pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200 and 17203, Plaintiff
3 requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
4 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
5 Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders; and upon a final hearing seeks
6 an order permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and
7 employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
8 Wage Orders.

9 128. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of
10 himself and **UCL Class** Members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully
11 belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful
12 and unfair business practices.

13 129. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
14 and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** Members are entitled to recover
15 reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

16 130. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of
17 herself and **UCL Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully
18 belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful
19 and unfair business practices.

20 131. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
21 and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** Members are entitled to recover
22 reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

23 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **CIVIL PENALTIES**

25 **(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

26 132. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

27 133. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§
28 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185,

1 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802.¹

2 134. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of herself
3 and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover civil penalties
4 pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not, be brought or
5 maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

6 135. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the
7 alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee
8 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt
9 hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of
10 Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing
11 through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as
12 “Aggrieved Employees”)

13 136. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code §
14 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”)
15 and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an intent to
16 investigate.

17 137. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil
18 penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226.7, 226(a), 510,
19 512, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802:

- 20 i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1174, 1194, 1198 and
21 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee per pay period for each
22 initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee per pay
23 period for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code §
24 2699(f)(2));

26 ¹ Plaintiff hereby reserves the right to seek penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for
27 Defendants’ violations of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code, suffered by Aggrieved
28 Employees, but not directly suffered by Plaintiff under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.*
(2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.

- 1 ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty
2 (30) days' pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);
- 3 iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
4 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
5 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully
6 withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful
7 or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-
8 five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee,
9 for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation
10 was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);
- 11 iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
12 employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two
13 hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of
14 the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation
15 that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
16 employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld
17 from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the
18 subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor
19 Code § 225.5);
- 20 v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial
21 citation, two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each
22 violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before
23 the filing of this action, one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each employee for
24 each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);
- 25 vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
26 employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid,
27 and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each subsequent pay
28 period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code §

558);

vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1);

viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, all others similarly situated, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. An order that the action be certified as a class action;
- b. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;
- c. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;
- d. Unpaid wages and overtime;
- e. Actual damages;
- f. Liquidated damages;
- g. Unreimbursed expenses;
- h. Restitution;
- i. Declaratory relief;
- j. Pre-judgment interest;

///

///

///

///

///

- 1 k. Civil and Statutory penalties;
2 l. Costs of suit;
3 m. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
4 n. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.
5

6 Dated: August 20, 2024

D.LAW, INC.

7
8 

9 _____
10 Emil Davtyan
11 David Yeremian
12 David Keledjian
13 Attorneys for Plaintiff
14 ALANAH LONGMIRE, and the putative class
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, all other similarly situated, and the general public, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: August 20, 2024

D.LAW, INC.



Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
David Keledjian
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ALANAH LONGMIRE, and the putative class

- 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

I am employed in the aforesaid county, State of California; I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 880 E Broadway, Glendale, CA 91205.

Deja Vu Showgirls – Sacramento, LLC
C T Corporation System
330 N. Brand Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91203

Deja Vu Showgirls
1112 N Saginow Street
Durand, MI 48429

Harry Mohny
1112 N Saginow Street
Durand, MI 48429

[X] (BY MAIL) I placed such envelope with postage thereon fully paid in the United States mail at Glendale, California. I am “readily familiar” with this firm’s practice of collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with U.S. Postal Service on that same day 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 1 day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ **(BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY)** I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the address above. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

[] **(COURTESY COPY BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION)** by use of email by scanning the documents and any and all documents and emailing them to email addresses above.

[X] (STATE) I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 23, 2024, at Glendale, California.


Jordan Floyd