

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Peter J. Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 295611]
peter@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
5198 Arlington Avenue, PMB 513
Riverside, CA 92504
Tel: (951) 320-1444 | Fax: (951) 320-1445

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

SYPRISS KRAEMER, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

CI FARMS, LLC, a California Limited
Liability Company; CLAYBOURNE
INDUSTRIES, INC., a California
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 20,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: CVRI2403341

*[Assigned to Hon. Harold Hopp, Dept. 1, for
all purposes]*

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
- (7) Unfair and Unlawful Competition

PAGA CLAIMS

- (8) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (9) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (10) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (11) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (12) Failure to Timely Pay Wages;
- (13) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages; and
- (14) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff Sypriss Kraemer (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and
2 on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action against his former employer(s), CI Farms, LLC,
5 Claybourne Industries, Inc., and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively, “Defendants”) on
6 behalf of all current and former nonexempt employees employed by Defendants in California
7 (the “Class” or “Represented Employees”) for Labor Code violations stemming from
8 Defendants’ failure to pay all wages owed, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages,
9 failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest breaks, failure to timely pay wages upon
10 separation of employment, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

11 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and alleges on information and belief that
12 the Represented Employees were subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and
13 corresponding wage and hour violations to which Plaintiff was subjected during employment.

14 3. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
15 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
16 worked at the proper rate of pay, which led to frequent and reoccurring unpaid compensable
17 time. As one such example, Plaintiff often performed work prior to his official shift start time
18 (with Defendants’ knowledge), yet Defendants only paid Plaintiff for hours worked after the
19 official start time (*e.g.*, if Plaintiff’s shift start time was 7:00 a.m., but he performed work for
20 Defendants beginning at 6:45 a.m., Defendants only paid him beginning at 7:00 a.m., despite that
21 Defendants were aware of and authorized the earlier work). These practices violate California
22 law. *Troester v. Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law “do[es] not allow
23 employers to require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without
24 compensation”); *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when
25 employee is under company’s control and where the tasks served the employer’s interests).

26 4. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Class often worked more than 8 hours per day
27 and/or 40 hours per week yet did not receive all required overtime compensation on such
28 occasions. Also, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Class were compensated on an hourly

1 basis plus additional earned compensation (such as bonuses and “premium pay”). However, on
2 the occasions when the Class worked overtime hours and received earned additional
3 compensation during the same workweek, Defendants failed to properly include these amounts
4 in the calculations for the regular rate of pay – in violation of California law.

5 5. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were also denied 30-minute off-duty
6 meal periods, as mandated by California law. As a result of Defendants’ policies and practices,
7 the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable
8 to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal period while under the
9 control of Defendants, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4) forced to take a meal
10 period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided mandated second meal periods for shifts
11 in excess of 10 hours.

12 6. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Represented Employees with
13 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
14 mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks for Plaintiff and the
15 Represented Employees and the Represented Employees were often not authorized and/or
16 permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload.
17 Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees worked longer shifts,
18 Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit additional mandated rest breaks.

19 7. Plaintiff further alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
20 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
21 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
22 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
23 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
24 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, wage premiums, vacation and sick wages, among others.

25 8. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
26 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

27 9. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants’ violations of the wage and hour components of
28 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their

level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over its competitors.

10. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the Represented Employees' employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees' employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

11. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, equitable, and monetary relief against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys' fees, penalties, costs and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199, among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the right to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

II. JURISDICTION

12. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

III. VENUE

13. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in Riverside County, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in Riverside County, and Defendants employs/employed Represented Employees in Riverside County.

IV. PARTIES

Plaintiff

14. Plaintiff and Class Representative Sypriss Kraemer was employed by Defendants and performed work for Defendants in Riverside County.

///

Defendants

15. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant CI Farms, LLC, is a California limited liability company authorized to and doing business in Riverside County and is or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees during the applicable periods.

16. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Claybourne Industries, Inc., is a California corporation authorized to and doing business in Riverside County and is or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees during the applicable periods.

17. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Represented Employees by virtue of Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when ascertained.

18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he and the Represented Employees worked under the joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and each of them, acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a unity of interest and ownership between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as a single employer of Plaintiff and other Represented Employees.

19. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally, Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor operations, and common ownership or financial control.

1 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting
2 themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active
3 concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in
4 all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times
5 Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the
6 agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining
7 co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and
8 purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of
9 their remaining co-Defendants.

10 21. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants
11 have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate
12 corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which
13 Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly,
14 the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed
15 jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the
16 separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege,
17 thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

18 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

19 22. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
20 as if fully alleged herein.

21 23. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as
22 a class action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

23 24. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning
24 four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

25 25. The Class, also referred to as the “Represented Employees,” that Plaintiff seeks to
26 represent is defined as follows:

27 All current and former nonexempt employees employed by
28 Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.

1
2 26. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

3 **Meal Break Subclass**

4 All Represented Employees who worked a shift in excess of
5 5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

6 **Rest Break Subclass**

7 All Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least
8 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

9 **Waiting Time Penalties Subclass**

10 All Represented Employees who separated from their
11 employment with Defendants during the period three years
12 before the filing of this action and ending when final
13 judgment is entered.

14 **Wage Statement Penalties Subclass**

15 All Represented Employees during the period one year
16 before the filing of this action and ending when final
17 judgment is entered.

18 27. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class description with greater
19 specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues as appropriate.

20 28. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that he
21 seeks to represent.

22 29. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
23 under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the
24 litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

25 30. **Numerosity:** The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that
26 a joinder of all Represented Employees is impracticable. Although the exact number is currently
27 unknown to Plaintiff, this information is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.
28

1 31. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which
2 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including
3 without limitation:

4 i. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
5 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all
6 hours worked;

7 ii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
8 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
9 Employees for hours above 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week;

10 iii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
11 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Meal Break
12 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
13 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a compliant
14 meal period was not provided;

15 iv. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
16 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Rest Break
17 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass
18 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a paid rest
19 break was not provided;

20 v. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
21 timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment between Defendants and Plaintiff and
22 the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass, whether such separation was voluntary or involuntary;

23 vi. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
24 provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized
25 wage statements;

26 vii. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§
27 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest
28 breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, and

1 failure to timely pay final wages; and

2 viii. Whether Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to equitable
3 relief pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

4 32. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims, as the Class Representative, are typical of the
5 claims of The Class. Plaintiff, like other members of The Class, was subjected to Defendants'
6 ongoing Labor Code and Wage Order violations including pertaining to the failure to pay all
7 wages owed, failure to provide mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to timely pay
8 wages upon separation of employment, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

9 33. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff, as Class Representative, will fairly and
10 adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's interests are not in conflict
11 with those of the Class. Class Representative's counsel are competent and experienced in
12 litigating employment class actions and other complex litigation matters similar to this case.

13 34. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class
14 action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this
15 controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of
16 law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual
17 members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to
18 recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action
19 treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is
20 most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

21 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

23 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

24 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

25 35. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
26 as if fully alleged herein.

27 36. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement
28 to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage (or the agreed-upon wage)

1 throughout the statutory period for each hour worked.

2 37. As noted herein, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided
3 proper minimum and regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and
4 compensate for all hours worked at the proper rate of pay. As a result of this policy and practice,
5 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required to perform off-the-clock work that
6 Defendants either knew or should have known they were performing.

7 38. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
8 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order § 4, and Cal.
9 Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

10 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
11 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
12 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

13 40. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
14 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each
15 hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay
16 them in accordance thereto.

17 41. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
18 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
19 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
20 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
21 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

22 42. During employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
23 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

24 43. As a result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
25 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

26 44. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
27 all unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs,
28 under Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1194.2, against Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

[illegible]

4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

23
24
25
26
27
28

26
27
28

1 52. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
2 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
3 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
4 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
5 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

6 53. During the employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
7 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

8 54. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
9 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

10 55. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
11 all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against
12 Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

13 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

15 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

16 *Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

17 56. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
18 as if fully alleged herein.

19 57. Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
20 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of laws governing mandatory meal periods.

21 58. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
22 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

23 59. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
24 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
25 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
26 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
27 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
28 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing

1 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

2 60. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
3 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
4 pay for each meal period that is missed.

5 61. At all relevant times, and as a result of the policies and practices described in this
6 Complaint, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were denied the 30-minute meal periods to
7 which they were entitled. Additionally, Defendants failed to record or keep accurate information
8 regarding when Represented Employees took their meal periods, in violation of the applicable
9 IWC Wage Order § 7(A)(3).

10 62. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
11 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not provided with all
12 mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass one
13 additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

14 63. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass did not
15 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
16 obtained from Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not willfully obtained, were not
17 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
18 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
19 to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

20 64. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Meal
21 Break Subclass all mandated meal breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
22 meal breaks, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

23 65. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
24 periods as required by California law and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of
25 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
26 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
27 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal period was not
28 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

1 66. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
2 and IWC Wage Order § 11, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Meal
3 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

4 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

6 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

7 *Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

8 67. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
9 as if fully alleged herein.

10 68. Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
11 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

12 69. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
13 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

14 70. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
15 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
16 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
17 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
18 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

19 71. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
20 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass one additional hour of pay at
21 their regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

22 72. At all relevant times, and as a result of the policies and practices described in this
23 Complaint, Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were denied mandated paid rest breaks.

24 73. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
25 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided with
26 all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass one
27 additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

1 74. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
2 Break Subclass all mandated rest breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
3 rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

4 75. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with rest breaks
5 as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of each rest
6 break not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage
7 Order § 12. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at the
8 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a paid rest break was not
9 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

10 76. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
11 and IWC Wage Order § 12, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Rest
12 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

13 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

15 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

16 *Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass Against All Defendants*

17 77. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
18 as if fully alleged herein.

19 78. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
20 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing
21 and payment of wages.

22 79. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
23 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

24 80. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
25 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
26 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

27 81. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
28 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is

1 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

2 82. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby
3 Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass were not paid all wages due and owing upon
4 separation of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

5 83. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all
6 wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass upon separation of
7 employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, and meal and
8 rest period premiums.

9 84. Additionally, at all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay all mandated sick
10 wages owed to the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass at the proper rate of pay under Labor Code §
11 246(l), leading to a failure to pay all wages owed upon separation of employment.

12 85. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
13 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass all
14 wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and
15 202. Consequently, pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendants owe Plaintiff and the Waiting
16 Time Penalties Subclass the above-described waiting time penalty, all in an amount to be shown
17 according to proof at trial and within the jurisdiction of this Court.

18 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

20 (Labor Code § 226)

21 *Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass Against All Defendants*

22 86. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
23 as if fully alleged herein.

24 87. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
25 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
26 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

27 88. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
28 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the

1 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
2 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
3 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
4 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

5 89. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
6 and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass due to violations including: failure to accurately state
7 total hours worked (for example, the wage statements failed to accurately state total hours
8 worked and/or reflect the correct compensable hours); failure to accurately state gross wages
9 earned, all deductions, and net wages earned (due to, for example, the failure to pay all required
10 minimum and overtime wages); failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate
11 overtime rate of pay); failure to state the inclusive dates of the pay period; failure to accurately
12 state the name and address of the legal entity of the employer; and failure to accurately state the
13 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

14 90. Moreover, Defendants' wage statements directly violated Labor Code § 226(a)
15 each period due to the failure to pay and report premium wages for denied meal periods and rest
16 breaks under § 226.7.

17 91. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
18 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a
19 wage statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
20 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

21 92. Defendants' failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the
22 Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the rate of
23 pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Wage
24 Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting miscalculation of wages, all of
25 which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said Defendants. As a direct result,
26 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered and continue to suffer,
27 substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and
28 expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation

1 under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to proof at trial.

2 93. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
3 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered an injury in
4 that each was prevented from knowing, understanding and disputing the wage payments paid to
5 them. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have each suffered an
6 injury in that the failure to show all wages earned on the itemized wage statements resulted in
7 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees being denied all necessary deductions, payments, and
8 withholdings owed by the employer, including, but not limited to, the failure to make all
9 necessary contributions for unemployment benefits, social security benefits, proper payment of
10 taxes and withholdings, and other mandated state and federal benefits.

11 94. Plaintiff has also been injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt
12 to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the
13 mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

14 95. Labor Code § 226(e) requires Defendants to pay the greater of all actual damages
15 or fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and
16 one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods, plus
17 attorney's fees and costs, to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass who were
18 injured by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a). The exact amount of the
19 applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

20 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION**

22 (Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*)

23 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

24 96. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
25 as if fully alleged herein.

26 97. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair
27 competition, which includes any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." The
28 Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact,

1 due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

2 98. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under Business &
3 Professions Code § 17021.

4 99. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California’s wage
5 and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide
6 mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses, and failure to
7 timely pay wages upon separation of employment, all to decrease their costs and increase profits.

8 100. At all times relevant herein, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Represented
9 Employees wages and monies and other financial obligations to which they were entitled.

10 101. As a result of Defendants’ failure to comply with the Labor Code and IWC
11 Orders, Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, suffered a loss of wages and monies, all in
12 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. Defendants’ ongoing violations of the
13 foregoing statutes and laws constitute a violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*

14 102. Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders and
15 its scheme to lower its payroll costs as alleged herein, constitute unlawful and unfair business
16 practices because it was done in a systematic manner over a period of time to the detriment of the
17 Plaintiff and all others similarly-situated.

18 103. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
19 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
20 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
21 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

22 104. A violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* may be
23 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
24 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, are
25 unlawful and in violation of public policy, and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive,
26 fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
27 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*
28

1 105. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is entitled to,
2 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge the profits which Defendants have
3 acquired, or of which Plaintiff and Represented Employees have been deprived, by means of the
4 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the
5 Represented Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the unfair
6 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

7 106. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
8 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
9 unlawful and/or fraudulent.

10 107. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and
11 Represented Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
12 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; an
13 order requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Represented
14 Employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5
15 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

16 **VI. PAGA CAUSES OF ACTION (Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)**

17 108. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as he was employed by
18 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
19 violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil
20 action filed on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved
21 employees in California against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed
22 (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

23 109. Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to
24 Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys' fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by
25 PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court
26 in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Therefore, Plaintiff is not required to, nor
27 does he, seek class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.
28

1 110. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing
2 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to
3 Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including
4 the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have
5 elapsed since the date Plaintiff provided the written notice of the claims alleged herein without
6 the LWDA assuming jurisdiction over the claims alleged. Accordingly, Plaintiff has fully
7 satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit under the PAGA.

8 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

10 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

11 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

12 111. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
13 as if fully alleged herein.

14 112. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to
15 be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each
16 hour worked.

17 113. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and
18 regular wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
19 worked. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were
20 required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they
21 were performing.

22 114. As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and
23 the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked.

24 115. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
25 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
26 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

27 116. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
28 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved

1 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

2 117. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
3 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
4 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

5 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

7 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

8 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

9 118. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
10 as if fully alleged herein.

11 119. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did
12 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

13 120. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
14 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
15 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
16 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
17 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
18 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

19 121. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by
20 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to
21 Defendants' practices described herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
22 Employees for all overtime hours worked at the proper rate of pay.

23 122. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
24 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because
25 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
26 week without proper overtime compensation.

27 123. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
28 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the

Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

124. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS

(Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

125. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

126. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing meal periods.

127. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

128. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

129. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B), Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each meal period that is missed.

130. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were denied the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled due to Defendants' policies and practices discussed herein.

1 131. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
2 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
3 all mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
4 one additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

5 132. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
6 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
7 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
8 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
9 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
10 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

11 133. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
12 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
13 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

14 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

16 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

17 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

18 134. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
19 as if fully alleged herein.

20 135. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
21 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

22 136. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
23 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

24 137. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
25 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
26 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
27 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
28 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

1 138. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
2 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
3 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

4 139. At all relevant times, and due to the policies and practices described herein,
5 Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with 10 minutes of net rest
6 break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as mandated by California law.

7 140. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
8 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
9 all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
10 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

11 141. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
12 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
13 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

14 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

16 (Labor Code § 204)

17 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

18 142. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
19 as if fully alleged herein.

20 143. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
21 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the timing of payment
22 of wages each period.

23 144. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
24 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
25 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
26 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
27 the following month.
28

145. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states “[t]he requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.”

147. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

149. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing and payment of final wages.

151. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid, without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

1 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

2 153. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
3 Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not
4 limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, sick pay at the proper rates, and meal and rest
5 period premiums, within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

6 154. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
7 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
8 due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

9 155. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
10 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
11 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

12 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

14 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

15 (Labor Code § 226)

16 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

17 156. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
18 as if fully alleged herein.

19 157. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
20 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of
21 accurate itemized wage statements.

22 158. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
23 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
24 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
25 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
26 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
27 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.
28

1 159. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
2 and the Aggrieved Employees due to violations including: failure to accurately state total hours
3 worked (for example, the wage statements failed to accurately state total hours worked and/or
4 reflect the correct compensable hours); failure to accurately state gross wages earned, all
5 deductions, and net wages earned (due to, for example, the failure to pay all required minimum
6 and overtime wages); failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime
7 rate of pay); failure to state the inclusive dates of the pay period; failure to accurately state the
8 name and address of the legal entity of the employer; and failure to accurately state the
9 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

10 160. Additionally, Defendants' wage statements directly violated Labor Code § 226(a)
11 each period due to the failure to pay and report premium wages for denied meal periods and rest
12 breaks under § 226.7.

13 161. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
14 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
15 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA

16 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

17 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and all others
18 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
19 follows:

- 20 1. As to the Eighth through Fourteenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all
21 applicable and available remedies under PAGA;
- 22 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under PAGA;
- 23 3. That the First through Seventh Causes of Action be certified as a class action;
- 24 4. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;
- 25 5. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;
- 26 6. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Seventh
27 Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and
28 Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;

1 7. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by
2 law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;

3 8. For restitution as provided by the Labor Code and Business and Professions Code
4 § 17200, *et seq.*;

5 9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200,
6 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5,
7 1194, 1197, 1198, and 1199, among other sections inadvertently omitted;

8 10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
9 not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties, including interest thereon;

10 11. For pre- and post-judgment interest; and

11 12. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

12 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

13 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby
14 demands a jury trial as to the First through Eighth Causes of Action pled herein.

15 Dated: August 19, 2024

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

16
17 BY:



Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
Peter J. Carlson, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff