

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
Rex J. Phillips (SBN 237747)
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413 / Fax: (949) 656-7760
Email: aaron@bartzlawgroup.com
rex@bartzlawgroup.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
10/17/2024 12:59 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By C. Vega, Deputy Clerk

Walter L. Haines, Esq. (SBN 71075)
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Tel.: (562) 256-1047 / Fax: (562) 256-1006
Email: walter@uelglaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff IVAN GASPAR and all others similarly situated

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

IVAN GASPAR, an individual; on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated and the
general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

FIRST RATE STAFFING COPORATION, a
Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No.: **24STCV27217**

) CLASS ACTION

) **COMPLAINT FOR:**

-) 1. Violation of B&PC §17200, et seq.
) 2. Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and
) 1198;
) 3. Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq.;
) 4. Failure to Pay Meal and Rest Break Premiums
) at the Proper Regular Rate of Pay (Labor Code
) §226.7)
) 5. Failure to Provide & Maintain Accurate Wage
) Statements Pursuant to Labor Code §226;
) 6. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code
) §226.7);
) 7. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code
) §226.7);
) 8. Failure to Reimburse Expenses (Lab. Code
) §2802);
) 9. Violation of Labor Code §§2698-2699 (PAGA).

) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 Plaintiff IVAN GASPAR, on behalf of himself and all other persons similarly situated,
2 and the general public (hereinafter, "Plaintiff"), hereby complains against Defendant FIRST
3 RATE STAFFING CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation ("First Rate"); and DOES 1 to
4 100, inclusive (hereinafter First Rate and Does 1-100 are collectively referred to herein as
5 "Defendants"), and on information and belief allege as follows:

6 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

7 **JURISDICTION**

8 1. This is a civil action seeking recovery of unpaid wages, waiting time penalties,
9 pay stub penalties and meal and rest period premiums under California Labor Code §§ 510,
10 1194 et seq., 201 et seq., 226 and 226.7. Plaintiff brings an action for monetary damages for
11 failure to pay wages as well as for restitution for Defendants' violations of Business and
12 Professions Code (B&PC) §17200, et seq., including full restitution of all compensation
13 retained by Defendants as a result of their unlawful, fraudulent and unfair business practices.
14 Plaintiff seeks all available relief, including full restitution of all compensation retained by
15 Defendants as a result of their unlawful and unfair business practices. Further, Plaintiff seeks
16 injunctive relief under B&PC §17200, et seq.

17 **VENUE**

18 2. Venue as to each of the Defendants is proper in this judicial district pursuant to
19 California Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts
20 complained of herein occurred in the County of Los Angeles. Each defendant either owns,
21 maintains offices, transacts business, has an agent or agents within the County of Los
22 Angeles, or otherwise is found within the County of Los Angeles, and each defendant is
23 within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

24 **PARTIES**

25 3. Ivan Gaspar ("Gaspar") is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all
26 relevant times herein, Plaintiff Gaspar worked for Defendants within the State of California.

27 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times
28 mentioned herein, defendant First Rate is a Delaware corporation.

1 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times
2 mentioned herein, Defendant First Rate was authorized to do business in the State of
3 California, County of Los Angeles, as an administrative staffing agency. Thus, each named
4 defendant and DOES 1 to 100 are subject to B&PC §17200, et seq. (Unfair Competition Law)
5 and the Labor Code, as hereinafter alleged.

6 6. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual,
7 partner, or corporate, of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that
8 reason, those defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek from this
9 Court leave to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered.
10 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants and each
11 fictitious defendant, whether individual, partners, or corporate, was responsible in some
12 manner for the circumstances alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff and all others
13 similarly situated hereinafter alleged and the general public to be subjected to the unlawful
14 employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.

15 7. At all times herein mentioned, each of the Defendants participated in the doing
16 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore,
17 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every
18 one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein
19 mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Plaintiff
20 herein alleges that Defendants and each of them is the joint employer of Plaintiff and the
21 classes.

22 8. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of
23 and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the
24 course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common
25 enterprise.

26 9. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants,
27 and each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and
28

every one of the other Defendants in proximately causing the complaints, injuries and damages alleged herein.

10. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants, thereby proximately causing the damages, as herein alleged.

11. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because both the individual and aggregate monetary damages and restitution sought herein exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established at trial, according to proof. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because Plaintiff and the putative classes herein worked within the State of California, and were subject to California's wage and hour laws.

PLAINTIFF CLASSES

12. The class representative Plaintiff who worked in the position of an hourly non-exempt employees or other similar title while employed by Defendants within the State of California, is as follows:

a. Ivan Gaspar

Plaintiff Gaspar worked within California as a non-exempt hourly employee for Defendants between March 2024 and May 2024.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

13. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a class action pursuant to CCP §382. The Classes which Plaintiff seeks to represent are composed of and defined as follows:

Class 1:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from 2020 through the date of judgment, who were not paid premium overtime and/or double time at the employee's regular rate of pay.

1 **Subclass 1:**

2 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California who were
3 paid for a missed meal or rest period at an allegedly “reduced” rate of pay from 2020 through
4 the date of judgment (Meal and Rest Reduced Rate Subclass);

5 **Class 2:**

6 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
7 2020 through the date of judgment, who were not paid the minimum wage for all hours
8 worked (Minimum Wage Class);

9 **Class 3:**

10 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California and who
11 worked at some point from 2021 through the present, who are no longer employed with
12 Defendants and to whom Defendants willfully failed to pay all wages due upon separation
13 from Defendants (Waiting Time Penalty Class);

14 **Class 4:**

15 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
16 2020 to the present who were not provided legally compliant meal periods (Meal Break
17 Class);

18 **Class 5:**

19 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
20 2020 through the present who were not provided legally-compliant rest breaks (Rest Break
21 Class);

22 **Class 6:**

23 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
24 2023 through the present who were provided a paystub (a.k.a. wage statement) which failed to
25 list all hours actually worked and wages owed (Pay Stub Class).

26 **Class 7:**

27 All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from
28 2020 through the present who were not reimbursed for their necessary and reasonable

1 business expenses (Reimbursement Class).

2 The members of the classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be
3 unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the classes are unknown to Plaintiff at this
4 time; however, it is estimated that the classes number greater than 100 individuals. The
5 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants'
6 employment records.

7 14. There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all others
8 similarly situated which predominate over questions affecting only individual members
9 including, without limitation to:

- 10 i. Whether Defendants paid their employees proper premium overtime
11 and/or double time at the employees' regular rate for hours over eight
12 (8) in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week, in paying their hourly
13 non-exempt employees;
- 14 ii. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions
15 including §510, 1194, and 203 by requiring substantial overtime work
16 and not paying for said work according to the overtime laws of the
17 State of California;
- 18 iii. Whether Defendants failed to pay the appropriate premium overtime
19 compensation to the hourly employees;
- 20 iv. Whether Defendants improperly retained, appropriated or deprived
21 Plaintiff and the class members of the use of monies or sums to which
22 Plaintiff and the class were legally entitled;
- 23 v. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices;
- 24 vi. Whether Defendants, and each of them, were participants in the alleged
25 unlawful conduct;
- 26 vii. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- 27 viii. The effect upon and the extent of injuries suffered by Plaintiff and all
28 others similarly situated and the appropriate amount of compensation;

- ix. The appropriate amount of monetary penalties allowed by Labor Code §201, et. seq.;
- x. Whether Defendants pay and continue to pay for missed meal and rest period premiums at an allegedly “reduced” rate of pay in violation of Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders;
- xi. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §226 and relevant IWC Wage Orders by failing to, among other violations, accurately report total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly work, by Plaintiff and the members of the Class;
- xii. Whether Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to maintain records for Plaintiff and members of the Class as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders;
- xiii. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the class members for necessary expenditures incurred in the performance of their work for Defendants;

15. Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of all members of the classes and subclasses mentioned herein. Plaintiff, as a representative party, will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the classes by vigorously pursuing this suit through their attorneys who are skilled and experienced in handling matters of this type. Plaintiff has no claim or interest that is antagonistic to any class member.

16. The nature of this action and the nature of laws available to the members of the classes and subclasses identified herein make use of the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to afford relief to Plaintiff for the wrongs alleged herein. Further, this claim involves a large corporate employer, Defendant First Rate, and a large number of individual employees (Plaintiff and all others similarly situated) with many relatively small claims with common issues of law and fact. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, the corporate defendants would necessarily gain an

unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Requiring each class member to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to pursue an action against their present and/or former employer for an appreciable and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damage to their careers at present and/or subsequent employment. Proof of a common business practice or factual pattern, of which the Plaintiff experienced, is representative of the class mentioned herein and will establish the right of each of the members of the named class to recovery on the causes of action alleged herein.

17. The prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or (b) legal determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the individual members of the class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto.

18. Plaintiff and all others similarly situated are entitled to the wages and other monies unlawfully withheld. This action is brought for the benefit of the public.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of B&PC §17200, et seq.)

19. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein the allegations of all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

20. Beginning on an exact date unknown to Plaintiff but believed to have occurred from 2020 on, Defendants have engaged in a pattern and practice of acts of unfair competition in violation of B&PC §17200, including the practices alleged herein.

1 21. Defendants, and each of them, own and operate truck centers throughout
2 California, and have engaged in the practice of paying their non-exempt employees, in a
3 fashion that circumvents California's wage and hour laws.

4 **FAILURE TO PAY PROPER WAGES AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION**

5 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that as part of
6 Defendants' ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants' hourly employees worked in
7 excess of eight (8) hours per day, and in excess of forty (40) hours per week without receiving
8 the proper regular rate of pay and/or minimum wage rate because Defendants fail to account
9 for all compensation due Plaintiff, including the fact that Plaintiff regularly worked off-the-
10 clock, including pre-shift and post-shift work to ensure that his jobs are completed, and
11 Defendants' compensation system does not account for time spent before and after their pre-
12 designated shifts. Defendants are therefore in violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194, and
13 the relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

14 23. Defendants, and each of them, consistently administered a corporate policy
15 regarding payment plans that do not compensate Plaintiff for all hours worked, which required
16 that employees work overtime without proper premium overtime pay, the regular rate of pay,
17 and/or minimum wage. This corporate policy and pattern of conduct is accomplished with the
18 advanced knowledge and designed intent to avoid paying non-exempt employees for all hours
19 worked by designating such work as no compensable. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the class
20 members are entitled to all unpaid wages due under California law. Further, Plaintiff and the
21 class are entitled to restitution of these wages obtained by Defendants, and each of them.

22 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 200, ET SEQ.**

23 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that as part of
24 Defendants' ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants failed to provide all employees all
25 wages at the time of their separation in violation of Labor Code § 200, et. seq., including but
26 not limited to, §§201, 202, 203 & 204.

27 25. Labor Code § 200, et seq. provides that an employer is required to pay an
28 employee all wages (including accrued vacation) immediately upon the employee's

1 involuntary separation from employment; immediately upon his or her voluntary separation if
2 the employee gave at least seventy-two (72) hours notice, and within seventy-two (72) hours,
3 if the employee voluntarily separated, but did not give at least seventy-two (72) hours notice.

4 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that all employees who
5 have been separated from Defendants did not timely receive a final paycheck detailing the
6 proper amount of pay from Defendants in violation of Labor Code § 200, et. seq.

7 27. Pursuant to Labor Code § 200, et seq. employees that no longer work for
8 Defendants, and who were not timely paid, are entitled to one (1) day of pay in penalties for
9 each day that he or she was paid late, until payment was made, up to a maximum of thirty (30)
10 days.

11 **VIOLATION OF MEAL AND REST PERIOD PROVISIONS**

12 28. Defendants' improper meal and rest period policies are in violation of
13 California law including, but not limited to Labor Code § 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC
14 Wage Orders. Plaintiff and the class were entitled to 1 hour of pay for each meal and rest
15 break violation at their regular rate of pay. Defendants failed and continue to fail to pay for
16 meal and rest period violations at the employees' regular rate of pay in violation of Section 11
17 of the applicable Wage Orders.

18 29. Plaintiff seeks restitution and injunctive relief for said violations.

19 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein
20 mentioned, Defendants have engaged in unlawful, deceptive, and unfair business practices
21 prohibited by California B&PC §17200, thereby depriving their employees and the putative
22 class the minimum working standards and conditions due to them under the California labor
23 laws and Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders as specifically described herein.
24 Plaintiff seeks an injunction preventing Defendants from continuing their unfair business
25 practice of improperly depriving their employees of overtime pay, and payment of their
26 regular rate of pay for meal and rest period premiums. Plaintiff further seeks an order
27 requiring Defendants to identify by full name, telephone number, and last known address
28 employees who worked or still work for Defendants between 2020 through the date of

1 judgment; Plaintiff further seeks an order requiring Defendants to timely pay restitution to all
2 current and former employees, including back wages, premium payments, and interest.

3 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

4 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that as part of Defendants'
5 ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants, and each of them, fail to provide their
6 employees with proper and understandable itemized wage statement, as required by Labor
7 Code § 226.

8 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and
9 each of them, fail to provide each employee with an itemized statement which states the actual
10 regular rate paid, the total hours worked by the employee, the gross and net wages earned, and
11 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
12 hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

13 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**

14 33. Defendants have adopted and implemented an illegal reimbursement policy
15 that fails to compensate Plaintiff for all of his necessary business expenses incurred in
16 discharging their duties for Defendants.

17 34. Defendants' conduct in failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the class for their
18 necessary business expenses is also unfair within the meaning of Business and Professions
19 Code §17200 because it is against established public policy and has been pursued to attain an
20 unjustified monetary advantage for Defendants by unfairly and unlawfully reducing Plaintiff's
21 and the other class members' compensation, as Plaintiff and the class are required to come out
22 of pocket for such expenses. As such, Defendants' business practices, including their illegal
23 reimbursement policy and practice, is unfair, illegal and fraudulent, in that such policy and
24 practice was intended to reduce Plaintiff's and the class' due and owing compensation.

25 //

26 //

27 //

RECOVERY OF UNPAID WAGES & PENALTIES
(Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)

36. Plaintiff and all others similarly situated identified herein were and are employed and scheduled as a matter of established company policy to work and in fact worked as non-exempt hourly employees in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or in excess of forty (40) hours per week. Defendants employed and scheduled all employees without providing overtime compensation for such excess hours worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and the relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) orders. Labor Code § 204 establishes the fundamental right of all employees in the State of California to be paid the proper amount of wages in a timely fashion for their work, including overtime. Defendants always had a written and verbal agreement to pay overtime and double time based on the Plaintiff's and classes' regular rate of pay.

38. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants have failed to pay to Plaintiff and all persons similarly situated wages when due as required by Labor Code § 204.

40. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants have treated Plaintiff as an hourly non-exempt employee. Despite this classification, Defendants have willfully violated the Labor Code with respect to meeting the requirements of paying one (1) regular rate of pay and calculating overtime and double time

1 based on that regular rate, as herein before alleged. Defendants have failed to properly pay
2 premium overtime for hours worked in a week, and as such, Defendants are able to reduce
3 their overhead and operating expenses and gain an unfair advantage over competing
4 companies complying with state law. Furthermore, Defendants have failed to include all
5 items of remuneration when determining the employees' regular rate of pay, as described
6 above.

7 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
8 consistently administered a corporate policy regarding both staffing levels and duties and
9 responsibilities of the members of the classes which required the entirety of all classes to work
10 overtime without proper premium pay, and to fail all wages for hours worked. This corporate
11 policy and pattern of conduct was/is accomplished with the advance knowledge and design of
12 all Defendants herein. Thus, Plaintiff and all others similarly situated routinely, regularly and
13 customarily performed overtime work and/or work that they failed to be compensated at the
14 appropriate hourly wage.

15 42. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the obligations and
16 responsibilities of the class employees are irrelevant because Plaintiff and all others similarly
17 situated merely allege wrongdoing with Defendants' pay plans, policies and practices.
18 Further, the duties of Plaintiff and all others similarly situated are not relevant in certifying
19 any of the classes.

20 43. Defendants, and each of them, had a consistent and uniform policy, practice
21 and procedure of willfully failing to pay the earned and unpaid wages of all such non-exempt
22 employees. Defendants have willfully failed to pay the earned and unpaid wages of such
23 individuals, including, but not limited to regular pay, premium pay, and other wages earned
24 and remaining uncompensated according to amendment, or proof.

25 44. The pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding
26 illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to
27 recovery by Plaintiff and all others similarly situated, in a civil action, for the unpaid balance
28 of the full amount of all wages owing, including the proper calculation of the regular rate and

1 the proper overtime premiums calculated at 1.5 or 2 times the legal regular rate which are
2 owing, including interest thereon, willful penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of
3 suit according to the mandate of Labor Code § 1194, et. seq.

4 45. Likewise, Defendants have a pattern, practice and uniform administration of
5 corporate policy regarding failure to comply with the required provisions of Labor Code §
6 226.7, in failing to pay Plaintiff and the class the meal and rest period premium payments at
7 the regular rate.

8 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq.)**

10 46. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein the allegations of all
11 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

12 47. Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq., provides that an employer is required to pay an
13 employee all wages (including accrued vacation) immediately upon an employee's
14 involuntary separation from employment; immediately upon her voluntary separation if the
15 employee gave at least seventy two (72) hours notice, and within seventy two (72) hours, if
16 the employee voluntarily separated, but did not give at least seventy two (72) hours notice.

17 48. Plaintiff Gaspar and other former employees of Defendants employed in the
18 State of California separated from employment with Defendants, and did not timely receive a
19 final pay check with all of their wages due from Defendants in violation of Labor Code §§
20 200, et seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants also
21 violated the mandates of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq., as to other employees whose
22 employment ended during the period of time covered by this action.

23 49. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq., each member of the class that no
24 longer works for Defendants, and who was not timely paid all of his or her wages due is
25 entitled to one (1) day of pay in penalties for each day that he or she was paid late, until
26 payment was made, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

27 //

28 //

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY MEAL AND REST PERIOD PREMIUMS AT THE PROPER**
3 **REGULAR RATE OF PAY**

4 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512, et seq.)**

5 50. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein the allegations of all
6 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

7 51. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Labor Code §226.7
8 requires an employer to pay an additional hour of compensation at the employee's regular rate
9 of pay for each meal period and rest period violation. During the class period, Plaintiff is
10 informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff and the
11 class members meal period and rest period premium pay at their regular rate of pay.
12 Defendants' improper meal and rest period practices and policies are in violation of California
13 law including, but not limited to Labor Code § § 226.7, 512, and the IWC Wage Orders.

14 52. Pursuant to Labor Code §226.7, Plaintiff is entitled to damages in an amount
15 equal to one (1) hour of the employee's regular rate of pay per each meal and rest period
16 violation, in a sum to be proven at trial.

17 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

19 **(Violation of Labor Code § 226)**

20 53. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein the allegations of all
21 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

22 54. Labor Code §226(a) provides, in pertinent part:

23 An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall
24 furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or
25 voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by
26 personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1)
27 gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as
28 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

1 of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security
2 number or an employee identification number other than a social security
3 number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if
4 the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section
5 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the
6 employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and
7 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
8 employee. . . .

9 55. During the Class Period, Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to
10 provide the Class Members, including Plaintiff Gaspar, with timely and accurate wage and
11 hour statements showing gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions made, net
12 wages earned, the name and address of the legal entity employing that Class Member, and all
13 applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of
14 hours worked at each hourly rate by that Class Member.

15 56. The Class Members, including Plaintiff, suffered injury as a result of
16 Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to provide the Class Members, with the wage and
17 hour statements required by law.

18 57. Based on Defendants' conduct as alleged herein, Defendants are liable for actual
19 damages, statutory damages and/or statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §
20 226, attorney's fees and costs and other applicable provisions of the Labor Code and
21 applicable Wage Order.

22 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

24 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512)**

25 58. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein the allegations of all
26 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

27 59. California Labor Code § 512 and IWC Wage Orders state that an employer
28 may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without
providing the employee a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, and an employer may not
employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the
employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes. Unless the employee is

1 relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an
2 “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. California Labor Code § 226.7(a) further
3 states that no employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period
4 mandated by an applicable order of the IWC.

5 60. Employers are prohibited from exerting coercion against the taking of, creating
6 incentives to forego, or otherwise encouraging the skipping of legally protected breaks.

7 61. Plaintiff and members of the Class were not provided with or given the
8 opportunity to take the requisite meal periods before the end of the first 5 hours of work, nor
9 were they provided with or given the opportunity to take a proper second meal period during
10 the days when they worked more than 10 hours in a day. Defendants coerced Plaintiff and the
11 members of the Class to forego meal periods by disciplining and/or threatening disciplinary
12 action against them if they attempted to take meal periods, created incentives to forego meal
13 breaks, and encouraged the skipping of meal periods by scheduling work to coincide with the
14 meal periods, among other things. In addition, Defendants placed unnecessarily tight
15 timelines on Plaintiff’s work, forcing him to miss his meal periods in order to complete his
16 jobs. As a result, Plaintiff and members of the Class were required to work and/or were not
17 relieved of all duties during any meal period taken, and thus were considered “on duty;”
18 however, Defendants failed to count as time worked any “on duty” meal period taken by
19 Plaintiff and the members of the Class.

20 62. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c) and IWC Wage Orders, if an
21 employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable
22 provisions of the IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay
23 at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday that the meal period is not provided.
24 As such, Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to an additional one hour’s pay for
25 each day in which Plaintiff and members of the Class were not provided a proper meal break
26 under the above-described authorities.

27 //

28 //

1 63. Plaintiff and the members of the Class request that the Court award interest on
2 all unpaid wages at the legal rate specified by California Civil Code § 3289(b), accruing from
3 the date the wages were due and payable pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6.

4 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE OR PERMIT REST PERIODS**

6 **(Violation of Labor Code § 226.7)**

7 64. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
8 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

9 65. The applicable IWC Wage Orders state that every employer shall authorize and
10 permit all employees to take rest periods. The authorized rest period time shall be based on
11 the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four hours of
12 work, or major fraction thereof. An employer must provide employees with 10 minutes' rest
13 for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six
14 hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.

15 66. Plaintiff and Class Members were not permitted to take rest periods, were
16 required to work during their rest periods, and/or were disciplined and/or were advised that
17 they would be disciplined if they took rest periods during work hours, in contravention of
18 California law. Moreover, based on Defendants' compensation plans, Plaintiff and Class
19 Members were not separately compensated for their rest periods as required under California
20 law.

21 67. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c) and the applicable IWC Wage
22 Orders, if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the
23 applicable IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
24 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

25 68. As such, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to an additional one
26 hour's pay for each day in which they were not provided a proper rest period under the above-
27 described authorities.

1 69. Plaintiff and the members of the Class request that the Court award interest on
2 all unpaid wages at the legal rate specified by California Civil Code § 3289(b), accruing from
3 the date the wages were due and payable pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6.

4 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES**

6 **(Violation of (Labor Code § 2802)**

7 70. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
8 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

9 71. California Labor Code § 2802 provides that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his
10 or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
11 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

12 72. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times
13 Plaintiff and the class members incurred certain expenses for their jobs with Defendants,
14 including but not limited to using their personal cell phones for company business, including
15 responding to work calls and text messages on their personal cell phones. Despite this,
16 Defendants failed and refused to indemnify Plaintiff and the class for all of their expenditures
17 in carrying out their duties for Defendants.

18 73. As a result of Defendants’ failure to indemnify Plaintiff and the class members,
19 they have suffered losses according to proof, including prejudgment interest, costs, and
20 attorneys’ fees in prosecuting this case.

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

23 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699)**

24 74. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
25 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

26 75. On or about August 12, 2024, Plaintiff Gaspar provided written notice to the
27 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants of the specific
28 provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
support the alleged violations.

1 76. The LWDA failed to respond to Plaintiff's counsel's correspondence and failed
2 to notify Plaintiff's counsel as to whether it would investigate the allegations contained
3 therein, within the time period requirements of the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA),
4 under Labor Code §2699.3. Plaintiff has fully complied with the notice requirements set forth
5 in Labor Code §2699.3 in order to commence a civil action against an employer pursuant to
6 Labor Code §2699.

7 77. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs for all hours worked, minimum wages,
8 overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest
9 periods, failure to pay all wages upon termination or resignation, and failure to provide
10 accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to reimburse expenses, will subject Defendants
11 to civil penalties pursuant to, without limitation, Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 510,
12 512, 551, 552, 1174, 1194, 1198, 2802 and IWC Wage Orders.

13 78. Plaintiffs are aggrieved employees as defined in Labor Code §§2699(a) and
14 (c), and related Labor Code provisions. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of
15 themselves, as private attorneys general, and in a representative capacity on behalf of other
16 aggrieved employees, affected by the labor law violations alleged herein.

17 79. Defendants committed numerous violations of the California Labor Code and
18 IWC Wage Orders against the Plaintiffs, and on information and belief, against members of
19 the Class and other current and former employees while they were employed by Defendants,
20 including but not limited to:

21 a. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 510, 511, 1194 and/or IWC Wage Orders
22 by failing to pay Plaintiff and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
23 current and former employees of Defendants, all minimum, straight time and overtime wages
24 owed in compliance with California law;

25 b. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 1194, 1197 and/or IWC Wage
26 Orders by failing to pay Plaintiff and the members of the Class by failing to pay for a missed
27 meal or rest period at the regular rate of pay;

28 c. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
failing to pay Plaintiff and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other

1 current and former employees of Defendants, all minimum wages owed in compliance with
2 California law;

3 d. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 204, 510, 511 and/or IWC Wage
4 Orders by failing to pay Plaintiff and the members of the Class, and on information and belief,
5 other current and former employees of Defendants, all wages owed in a timely manner in
6 compliance with California law;

7 e. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7, 512, and /or IWC Wage Orders by
8 failing to provide Plaintiff and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
9 current and former employees of Defendants, the opportunity to take the requisite meal
10 periods in compliance with California law;

11 f. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
12 failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the members of the Class, and on information and
13 belief, other current and former employees of Defendants, the opportunity to take the requisite
14 rest periods in compliance with California law;

15 g. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226, 1174 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
16 failing to properly maintain accurate employment time and records, maintain and/or submit
17 accurate itemized wage statements on behalf of Plaintiff, members of the Class, and on
18 information and belief, on behalf of other current and former employees of Defendants as
19 described herein; and

20 h. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
21 failing to pay Plaintiff, the Class, and on information and belief, other current and former
22 employees of Defendants as described herein; and

23 i. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to indemnify Plaintiff and
24 members of the Class and on information and belief, other current and former employees of
25 Defendants as described herein.

26 8. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiff, members of the Class, and all other
27 aggrieved current and former employees seek to recover civil penalties, as otherwise provided
28 by statute and wage order, for which Defendants are liable as a result of their violations of the
California Labor Code and applicable wage order(s) in an amount to be proven at trial. These
penalties include, but are not limited to, those provided by Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204,
210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 2699, 2802 and IWC Wage

1 Orders. Plaintiff and aggrieved current and former employees further seek and award of
2 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 and 2699.

3
4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays:

6 1. That the Court determine this action may be maintained as a class action;

7 **As to the First Cause of Action:**

8 2. For an order preliminarily and permanently enjoining Defendants from
9 engaging in the practices challenged herein;

10 3. An order for full restitution of all monies, as necessary and according to proof,
11 to restore any and all monies withheld by the Defendants by means of the unfair practices
12 complained of herein. Plaintiff seeks, on behalf of the putative class, the appointment of a
13 receiver, as necessary. The restitution includes all monies retained as wages, as defined in
14 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 510 and 1194, and interest, and attorneys' fees as a result of the
15 unfair business practices;

16 4. For an order finding and declaring that Defendants' acts and practices as
17 challenged herein are unlawful, and unfair and/or fraudulent;

18 5. For an accounting, under administration of Plaintiff and subject to court
19 supervision, to determine the amount to be returned by Defendants and the amounts to be
20 refunded to members who are or were not paid all their wages due to Defendants' unfair
21 business practices;

22 6. For the creation of an administrative process wherein each injured current and
23 former employee receives his or her back wages in the form of overtime pay or alternatively
24 that each current or former eligible employee may submit a claim in order to receive his/her
25 money;

26 7. For an order requiring Defendants to make full restitution and payment
27 pursuant to B&PC §§ 17200, et seq.;

28 8. For all other appropriate declaratory and equitable relief;

9. For pre-judgment interest to the extent permitted by law;

1 10. For an order requiring Defendants to identify, by name, address and telephone
2 number of each person who worked in California as an hourly non-exempt employee for
3 Defendants between 2020 through the time of judgment;

4 11. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

5 **As to the Second and Fourth Cause of Action:**

6 12. For damages according to proof, as set forth in Labor Code §§ 510, 226.7 and
7 1194, et seq., (and the applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders)
8 regarding wages due and owing;

9 13. For pre-judgment interest as allowed by Labor Code § 1194 and California
10 Civil Code § 3287(b), for waiting time penalties as authorized by Labor Code § 203, and for
11 reasonable attorneys' fees;

12 14. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

13 **As to the Third Cause of Action:**

14 15. For waiting time penalties for all former employees not timely paid their last
15 pay check, including vacation pay;

16 16. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

17 17. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

18 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action:**

19 18. For recovery as authorized by Labor Code §226(e);

20 19. For injunctive relief to ensure Defendants' compliance with Labor Code §226
21 and the IWC Wage Orders §7(A) pursuant to Labor Code §226(h);

22 20. For an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code
23 §226(e) and/or §226(h);

24 21. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

25 **As to the Sixth Cause of Action:**

26 22. One (1) hour of pay at each of the employees' regular rate of compensation for
27 each workday that a meal period was not provided, impeded, discouraged and/or dissuaded;

28 23. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

1 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action:**

2 24. One (1) hour of pay at each of the employees' regular rate of compensation for
3 each workday that a rest period was not authorized or permitted, or impeded, interrupted,
4 discouraged and/or dissuaded;

5 25. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

6 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action:**

7 26. For recovery of all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by Plaintiff and
8 the class members, according to proof;

9 27. For pre-judgment interest as allowed by Labor Code §§ 218.6, 1194(a), and
10 Civil Code § 3287;

11 28. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §
12 2802(c);

13 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action:**

14 29. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
15 Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2698 and 2699;

16 30. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law;

17 31. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
18 California Labor Code § 2699(g); and

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

21 **As to All Causes of Action:**

22 33. For reasonable costs incurred;

23

24

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

34. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: October 17, 2024

BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC

By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
AARON A. BARTZ
REX J. PHILLIPS
Attorneys for Plaintiff Ivan Gaspar
and all others similarly situated

- 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

Dated: October 17, 2024

By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
AARON A. BARTZ
REX J. PHILLIPS
Attorneys for Plaintiff Ivan Gaspar
and all others similarly situated