

August 8, 2024

Filed via the LWDA's PAGA Claim Notice Online Form

LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1039813-24

Initial PAGA Notice Provided to LWDA on July 16, 2024

Copies Sent via Certified U.S. Mail to:

Brooks Technology Group LLC	Human Resources
% Melita J. Murphy	Brooks Technology Group LLC
25591 Indian Hill Lane, Unit A	2601 South Pavilion Center Drive, Unit 2080
Laguna Hills, California 92653	Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

**Re: Supplemental PAGA Notice re:
Lord v. Brooks Technology Group LLC
Notice of Intent to File Suit Pursuant to California Labor Code
Section 2699**

To Whom It May Concern:

This correspondence shall serve as a supplemental follow-up to our California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") notice letter dated July 16, 2024 (the "Notice") in which our office set forth the facts and theories underlying the claims of our client, Gwinnon Lord ("Plaintiff"), against Brooks Technology Group LLC ("Defendant"). A copy of the original Notice is enclosed as **Exhibit 1**. This letter incorporates by reference the facts, law, theories, and allegations of Exhibit 1.

As described in the Notice, Plaintiff filed a class action complaint against Defendant on July 16, 2024, in the Superior Court for the State of California for the County of Orange. The action is currently pending as *Lord v. Brooks Technology Group LLC* (Orange Cnty. Sup. Ct., No. 30-2024-01412325-CU-OE-CXC) (the "Action"). In the Notice, our office explained Plaintiff's intent to proceed with a claim for civil penalties in the Action pursuant to PAGA based on the facts and theories described in detail in the Notice and its exhibit. (See Lab. Code, §§ 2698–2699.6.)

By this letter, Plaintiff supplements his original Notice to further notify the LWDA of details concerning the piece-rate violations that have been committed and continue to be committed by Defendant against Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. For the purposes of this letter, the "Aggrieved Employees" share the same definition as was provided in Plaintiff's original Notice: *All individuals who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California, from one year prior to the mailing of the Notice through the date of trial.*

Plaintiff will be filing an amended complaint detailing Defendant's failure to pay the Aggrieved Employees separately and hourly in violation of Labor Code section 226.2, as well as the facts, law, theories, and allegations provided in Plaintiff's original Notice. A copy of the amended complaint, as is currently drafted and as is intended to be filed in the Action, is enclosed as **Exhibit 2**. This letter incorporates by reference the facts, law, theories, and allegations of Exhibit 2.

This letter serves as notice pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), codified at California Labor Code sections 2698 through 2699.6, that we intend to include representative claims in the Action for civil penalties under PAGA on behalf of a group of aggrieved employees. For the purposes of this letter, "Aggrieved Employees" is defined as: *All individuals who are or were employed by Defendant as non-exempt employees in California, from one year prior to the mailing of this notice through the date of trial.*

As set forth in more detail in Exhibit 2, Defendant violated its obligations to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees under California law by: failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, failing to pay all overtime wages earned, failing to provide lawful rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums, failing to provide lawful meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums, failing to maintain accurate records, failing to pay the Aggrieved Employees separately and hourly for their rest and recovery periods, failing to pay the Aggrieved Employees separately and hourly for their nonproductive time, failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses, failing to provide accurate and complete wage statements, failing to pay all wages in full and on time during employment, and failing to pay all wages due upon termination.

Because of these systemic violations, Defendant violated: Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2804, and California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders Wage Orders 4-2001 and/or 16-2001, and others that may be applicable. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.) Exhibit 2 further details: **(1)** the alleged violations; **(2)** the facts and theories supporting these violations; **(3)** the people and entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions at issue; and **(4)** the illegal practices instituted by Defendant.

Together with this correspondence, Exhibit 2 provides notice that we intend to proceed with a claim for civil penalties in the Action pursuant to PAGA. (See Lab. Code, §§ 2698–2699.6.) We intend to fully prosecute the representative claims alleged in the complaint, including by obtaining civil penalties under PAGA.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Notice of Intent to File PAGA Action

August 8, 2024

Page 3 of 3

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'K. Smith', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

KYLE D. SMITH

Enclosure

EXHIBIT 1

Plaintiff's Initial PAGA Notice

July 15, 2024

Filed via the LWDA's PAGA Claim Notice Online Form

Copies Sent via Certified U.S. Mail to:

Brooks Technology Group LLC	Human Resources
% Melita J. Murphy	Brooks Technology Group LLC
25591 Indian Hill Lane, Unit A	2601 South Pavilion Center Drive, Unit 2080
Laguna Hills, California 92653	Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

Re: *Gwinnon Lord v. Brooks Technology Group LLC*
Notice of Intent to File Suit Pursuant to California Labor Code
Section 2699

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Gwinnon Lord ("Plaintiff") and a group of the putative class members in a forthcoming lawsuit against Brooks Technology Group LLC ("Defendant"). The action, entitled *Gwinnon Lord v. Brooks Technology Group LLC*, is to be filed in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Orange (the "Action"). A copy of the complaint as currently drafted, and as is intended to be filed in the Action, is enclosed as **Exhibit A**. This letter incorporates by reference the facts, law, and allegations of Exhibit A.

This letter serves as notice pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), codified at California Labor Code sections 2698 through 2699.6, that we intend to include representative claims in the Action for civil penalties under PAGA on behalf of a group of aggrieved employees. For the purposes of this letter, "Aggrieved Employees" is defined as: *All individuals who are or were employed by Defendant as non-exempt employees in California, from one year prior to the mailing of this notice through the date of trial.*

As set forth in more detail in Exhibit A, Defendant violated its obligations to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees under California law by: failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, failing to pay all overtime wages earned, failing to provide lawful rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums, failing to provide lawful meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums, failing to maintain accurate records, failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses, failing to provide accurate and complete wage statements, failing to pay all wages in full and on time during employment, and failing to pay all wages due upon termination.

Because of these systemic violations, Defendant violated: Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2084, and California Industrial

Notice of Intent to File PAGA Action

July 15, 2024

Page 2 of 2

Welfare Commission Wage Orders Wage Orders 4-2001 and/or 16-2001, and others that may be applicable. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.) The enclosed Complaint further details: **(1)** the alleged violations; **(2)** the facts and theories supporting these violations; **(3)** the people and entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions at issue; and **(4)** the illegal practices instituted by Defendant.

Together with this correspondence, the enclosed complaint provides notice that we intend to proceed with a claim for civil penalties in the Action pursuant to PAGA. (See Lab. Code, §§ 2698–2699.6.) We intend to fully prosecute the representative claims alleged in the complaint, including by obtaining civil penalties under PAGA.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



KYLE D. SMITH

Enclosure

EXHIBIT A

(Anticipated Class Action Complaint in
*Gwinnon Lord v. Brooks Technology Group
LLC*)

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.
Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218)
jm@melmedlaw.com
Kyle D. Smith (SBN 280489)
ks@melmedlaw.com
1801 Century Park East, Suite 850
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: (310) 824-3828
Fax: (310) 862-6851

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

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

GWINNON LORD, an individual, on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BROOKS TECHNOLOGY GROUP LLC, a
Nevada Limited Liability Company; and DOES
1 TO 50,

Defendants.

Case Number: _____

Class Action Complaint For:

1. Failure to Pay All Minimum Wages,
2. Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages,
3. Failure to Provide Rest Periods and Pay Missed Rest Period Premiums,
4. Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Pay Missed Meal Period Premiums,
5. Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records,
6. Failure to Pay Wages Timely during Employment,
7. Failure to Pay All Wages Earned and Unpaid at Separation,
8. Failure to Indemnify All Necessary Business Expenditures,
9. Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements, and
10. Violations of California's Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 17200–17210).

Plaintiff Gwinnon Lord (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated employees within the State of California, complains and alleges of defendants Brooks Technology Group LLC and Does 1 to 50 (collectively, “Defendants”), and each of them, as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a class action complaint brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

2. The “Class Period” as used herein, is defined as the period from four years prior to the filing of this action and continuing into the present and ongoing. Defendants’ violations of California’s laws as described more fully below have been ongoing throughout the Class Period and are still ongoing.

3. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of himself and the following class: *All individuals who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the Class Period* (the “Class Members”). (Code Civ. Proc., § 382.)

4. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the Class Members, as a class action, against Defendants for:

- A. Failure to pay all minimum wages,
- B. Failure to pay all overtime wages,
- C. Failure to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums,
- D. Failure to provide meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums,
- E. Failure to maintain accurate employment records,
- F. Failure to pay wages timely during employment,
- G. Failure to pay all wages earned and unpaid at separation,
- H. Failure to indemnify all necessary business expenditures,
- I. Failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements, and

1 J. Violations of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") (Bus. & Prof.
2 Code, §§ 17200–17210).

3 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the California Industrial
4 Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders applicable to the facts of this case are IWC Wage Orders
5 4-2001 and/or 16-2001 (the "Applicable Wage Orders") and possibly others that may be applicable.
6 (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.) Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the
7 definition of "Applicable Wage Orders" with greater specificity or add additional IWC Wage Orders
8 if additional applicable wage orders are discovered in litigation.

9 **II. JURISDICTION & VENUE**

10 6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein
11 pursuant to Article VI, section 10, of the California Constitution and Code of Civil Procedure section
12 410.10 because this is a civil action in which the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest, exceeds
13 \$25,000, and because each cause of action asserted arises under the laws of the State of California or
14 is subject to adjudication in the courts of the State of California.

15 7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants have caused
16 injuries in the County of Orange and the State of California through their acts, and by their violation
17 of the California Labor Code and California state common law. Defendants transact millions of dollars
18 of business within the State of California. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have an
19 agent or agents within the County of Orange, and/or otherwise are found within the County of Orange,
20 and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

21 8. Venue as to Defendants is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to section 395 of the
22 Code of Civil Procedure. Defendants operate within California and do business within Orange County,
23 California. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and all of Defendants'
24 employees identified above within Orange County and surrounding counties where Defendants may
25 remotely operate.

26 9. This matter is not appropriate for removal under the Class Action Fairness Act (28
27 U.S.C. § 1332) as the amount in controversy for Plaintiff's and the Class Members' claims, in
28 aggregate, is less than \$5 million. Additionally, all the allegations herein occurred in the State of

1 California. As such, even if the amount in controversy did exceed \$5 million this matter would still not
2 be appropriate for removal under the “local controversy” exception to the Class Action Fairness Act.
3 (28 U.S.C. § 1332, subd. (d)(4)(A).)

4 **III. THE PARTIES**

5 **A. PLAINTIFF**

6 10. At all relevant times, Plaintiff, who is over the age of 18, was and currently is a citizen
7 of California residing in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt hourly
8 employee.

9 11. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following class pursuant to
10 section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure as follows: *All individuals who are or were employed by*
11 *Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the Class Period* (the “Class Members”).

12 12. The Class Members, at all times pertinent hereto, are or were employees of Defendants
13 during the relevant statutory period.

14 **B. DEFENDANTS**

15 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants were authorized
16 to and doing business in Orange County and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the other
17 Class Members during the applicable statutory periods. Plaintiff and the other Class Members were,
18 and are, subject to Defendants’ policies and/or practices complained of herein and have been deprived
19 of the rights guaranteed to them by: California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226,
20 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802,
21 2804, and others that may be applicable; California Business and Professions Code sections 17200
22 through 17210 (“UCL”); and the Applicable Wage Orders (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160).

23 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the Class
24 Period, Defendants did (and continue to do) business in the State of California, County of Orange.

25 15. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
26 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as Does 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said defendants
27 are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to amend this
28 complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and

1 thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate, were
2 responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff
3 and the other Class Members to be subject to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and
4 damages complained of herein.

5 16. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
6 herein, Defendants were and/or are the employers of Plaintiff and the other Class Members. At all times
7 herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to
8 have been done by the named Defendants. Furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the
9 agents, representatives, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, and at all times
10 herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said agency, representation, and
11 employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, or otherwise ratified every one of
12 the acts or omissions complained of herein.

13 17. Plaintiff is further informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times
14 mentioned herein, that Defendants, and each of them, are the alter egos of one another and that there
15 existed and now exists a unity of interest and ownership between them such that the individuality and
16 separateness of each of them has ceased. Plaintiff is further informed, and believes, and thereon alleges,
17 that at all times mentioned herein, that Defendants, and each of them, have been and now are mere
18 shells and naked frameworks that their principal uses for the conduct of that Defendant's own business,
19 property, and affairs, for which Defendants, and each of them, have concealed and misrepresented their
20 identities as the entities responsible for their ownership, management, and financial interests.

21 18. Plaintiff is further informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times
22 mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture,
23 partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of and in pursuance of said
24 joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and
25 thereon alleges, that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and the other
26 Class Members.

1 **IV. COMMON FACTS & ALLEGATIONS**

2 19. Plaintiff and the other Class Members (collectively, the “Class Members”) are, and were
3 at all relevant times, employed by the Defendants within the State of California.

4 20. The Class Members are, and were, at all relevant times, non-exempt employees for the
5 purposes of minimum wages, overtime, rest breaks, meal periods, and the other claims alleged in this
6 complaint.

7 21. Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within the statutory Class Period,
8 working as an hourly, non-exempt field inspector for Defendants. Plaintiff’s duties included driving to
9 various assigned locations, documenting telephone poles and vegetation, documenting GPS locations,
10 and documenting any additional pertinent information during inspections.

11 **A. MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

12 22. Labor Code section 1197 requires employees to be paid at least the minimum wage fixed
13 by the IWC, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. Similarly, Labor Code
14 section 1194 entitles “any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage . . . to recover in a
15 civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage.” Likewise, the Applicable
16 Wage Orders also obligate employers to pay each employee minimum wages for all hours worked.
17 (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.) Labor Code section 1198 makes unlawful the employment
18 of an employee under conditions that the IWC Wage Orders prohibit.

19 23. These minimum wage standards apply to each hour that employees work. Therefore, an
20 employer’s failure to pay for any particular time worked by an employee is unlawful, even if averaging
21 an employee’s total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above
22 minimum wage. (*Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324.)

23 24. Here, Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of the
24 law during the relevant statutory periods. The Class Members were not compensated for all hours
25 worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants and/or
26 suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and the Applicable Wage Orders.
27 Among other violations, the Class Members were subject to the control of Defendants while off-the-
28 clock and did not receive minimum wage for each hour worked.

1 25. Additionally, the Class Members were not paid all wages for all hours worked due to
2 Defendants' uniform payroll policies and practices that unfairly rounded employees' wages to the
3 detriment of the Class Members. This rounding policy routinely failed to capture the entirety of the
4 hours the Class Members worked and was structured in a way that in favored underpayment. (See *See's*
5 *Candy Shops, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 889, 907.) As a result, the Class Members
6 suffered periodic shortages in the hours for which they were compensated. This uncompensated time
7 violated California's requirement that employees be compensated for all hours worked. As a result of
8 this practice, the Class Members were not compensated their minimum wages for all hours worked.

9 26. Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2, subdivision (a), provide that an
10 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees
11 the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages
12 due and interest thereon.

13 27. When employees, such as the Class Members, are not paid for all hours worked under
14 Labor Code section 1194, they are entitled to recover minimum wages for the time which they received
15 no compensation. (See *Sillah v. Command International Security Services* (N.D. Cal. 2015) 154
16 F.Supp.3d 891 [employees suing for failure to pay overtime could recover liquidated damages under
17 Labor Code section 1194.2 if they also showed they were paid less than minimum wage].)

18 28. Labor Code section 1197.1 authorizes employees who are paid less than the minimum
19 wage fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order of the IWC, a civil penalty, among other
20 damages, as follows:

21 (1) "For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred
22 dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for
23 which the employee is underpaid."

24 (2) "For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two
25 hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
26 period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the
27 initial violation is intentionally committed." (Lab. Code, § 1197.1, subd.
28 (a).)

1 29. As set forth above, Defendants failed to fully compensate the Class Members for all
2 minimum wages. Accordingly, the Class Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages for
3 violations of Labor Code section 1197.1.

4 30. Based upon these same factual allegations, the Class Members are likewise entitled to
5 penalties under Labor Code sections 1199.

6 **B. OVERTIME VIOLATIONS**

7 31. Labor Code section 510 requires employers to compensate employees who work more
8 than eight hours in one workday, forty hours in a workweek, and for the first eight hours worked on
9 the seventh consecutive day no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.
10 (Lab. Code, § 510, subd. (a).) Further, Labor Code section 510 obligates employers to compensate
11 employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve
12 hours in a day or more than eight hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. (Lab. Code, § 510,
13 subd. (a).) These rules are also reflected in the Applicable Wage Orders.

14 32. In accordance with Labor Code section 1194 and the Applicable Wage Orders, the Class
15 Members could not then agree and cannot now agree to work for a lesser wage than the amount
16 provided by Labor Code sections 510 or the Applicable Wage Orders.

17 33. Here, Defendants violated their duty to accurately and completely compensate the Class
18 Members for all overtime worked. The Class Members periodically worked hours that entitled them to
19 overtime compensation under the law but were not fully compensated for those hours.

20 34. Moreover, during the relevant statutory periods, Defendants had a policy and practice
21 of failing to pay overtime wages at the proper rate when it actually paid overtime. Specifically, when
22 Defendants paid overtime wages to the Class Members, Defendants failed to include all compensation
23 when calculating the regular rate of pay used in overtime calculations and when paying overtime.

24 35. For instance, the Class Members would often receive, along with their hourly rates of
25 pay for their working hours, additional remuneration and/or non-discretionary bonus pay. Defendants,
26 however, calculated the regular rate of pay for the Class Members without factoring into the regular
27 rate of pay all other non-hourly pay earnings received during the pay period. As a result, the Class
28 Members were underpaid overtime wages when they worked in excess of eight hours in any workday

1 and/or forty hours in a workweek when such additional forms of remuneration were earned. By its
2 practice of periodically requiring the Class Members to work in excess of eight hours in a workday
3 and/or forty hours in a workweek without compensating them at the rate of one and one-half (1½) their
4 regular rate of pay, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and
5 1199.

6 36. These actions were and are in clear violation of California’s overtime laws as set forth
7 in Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1199, and the Applicable Wage Orders. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8,
8 §§ 11040, 11160.) As a result of Defendants’ faulty policies and practices, the Class Members were
9 not compensated for all hours worked or paid accurate overtime compensation.

10 **C. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS**

11 37. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Orders, Defendants
12 were and are required to provide the Class Members with compensated, duty-free rest periods of not
13 less than ten minutes for every major fraction of four hours worked. Under the Applicable Wage
14 Orders, an employer must authorize and permit all employees to take ten minute duty free rest periods
15 for every major fraction of four hours worked. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.)

16 38. Likewise, Labor Code section 226.7 provides that “[a]n employer shall not require an
17 employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute,
18 or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission” (Lab. Code, §
19 226.7, subd. (b).) Labor Code section 226.7 also provides that employers must pay their employees one
20 additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate for each workday that a “meal or rest or recovery
21 period is not provided.” (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c).) The “regular rate” for these purposes must
22 factor in all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by the employee, including non-
23 discretionary bonuses, commissions, and other forms of wage payments exceeding the employees’ base
24 hourly rate. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 878.) Thus, the Wage
25 Orders set when and for how long the rest period must take place and the Labor Code establishes that
26 violations of the IWC Wage Orders are unlawful and sets forth the premium pay employer must pay
27 their employees when employers fail to provide rest periods.
28

1 39. The California Supreme Court has held that, during required rest periods, “employers
2 must relieve their employees of all duties and relinquish any control over how employees spend their
3 break time.” (*Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 260.) Relinquishing
4 control over employees during rest periods requires that employees be “free to leave the employer’s
5 premises” and be “permitted to attend to personal business.” (*Id.* at p. 275.) The *Brinker* Court
6 explained in the context of rest breaks that employer liability attaches from adopting an unlawful
7 policy:

8 “An employer is required to authorize and permit the amount of rest break time
9 called for under the wage order for its industry. If it does not—if, for example,
10 it adopts a uniform policy authorizing and permitting only one rest break for
11 employees working a seven-hour shift when two are required—it has violated
12 the wage order and is liable.” (*Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53
13 Cal.4th 1004, 1033.)

14 40. Here, Defendants periodically did not permit the Class Members to take compliant duty-
15 free rest breaks, free from Defendants’ control as required by Labor Code section 226.7, the Applicable
16 Wage Orders, and applicable precedent. (See *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th
17 257, 269 [concluding that “during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and
18 relinquish control over how employees spend their time.”].) At all relevant times, the Class Members
19 were periodically not provided with legally-compliant and timely rest periods of at least ten minutes
20 for each four hour work period, or major fraction thereof due to Defendants’ unlawful rest period
21 policies/practices. The Class Members were often expected and required to continue working through
22 rest periods to meet the expectations Defendants and finish the workday. In some cases when the Class
23 Members worked more than ten hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a third
24 mandated rest period. As a result, the Class Members were periodically unable to take compliant rest
25 periods.

26 41. In such cases where Defendants did not offer the Class Members the opportunity to
27 receive a compliant off-duty rest period, “the court may not conclude employees voluntarily chose to
28 skip those breaks.” (*Alberts v. Aurora Behavioral Health Care* (2015) 241 Cal.App.4th 388, 410 (2015))

1 ["If an employer fails to provide legally compliant meal or rest breaks, the court may not conclude
2 employees voluntarily chose to skip those breaks."]; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court, supra*, 53
3 Cal.4th at p. 1033 ["No issue of waiver ever arises for a rest break that was required by law but never
4 authorized; if a break is not authorized, an employee has no opportunity to decline to take it."].)

5 42. In addition to failing to authorize and permit compliant rest periods, the Class Members
6 were not compensated with one hour's worth of pay at their regular rate of compensation when they
7 were not provided with a compliant rest period in accordance with Labor Code section 226.7,
8 subdivision (c). Thus, Defendants have violated Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage
9 Orders.

10 43. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to recover, on behalf of himself and other non-
11 exempt employees, rest period premiums and penalties.

12 **D. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS**

13 44. Labor Code section 512 and the Applicable Wage Orders require employers to provide
14 employees with a thirty-minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal period within the first five hours of
15 work. (Lab. Code, § 512, subd. (a) ["An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
16 more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30
17 minutes"]; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160 ["No employer shall employ any person
18 for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes"].)
19 Additionally, an employee who works more than ten hours per day is entitled to receive a second thirty-
20 minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal period. (Lab. Code, § 512, subd. (a) ["An employer shall not
21 employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee
22 with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes"].)

23 45. "An on-duty meal period is permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
24 employee from being relieved of all duty and the parties agree in writing to an on-duty paid meal
25 break." (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.* (2016) 5 Cal.App.5th 926, 932.) The written agreement must
26 include a provision allowing the employee to revoke it at any time. (*Ibid.*) Generally, the California
27 Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("DLSE") and courts
28 have "found that the nature of the work exception applies: (1) where the work has some particular

1 external force that requires the employee to be on duty at all times, and (2) where the employee is the
2 sole employee of a particular employer.” (*Id.* at p. 945, internal quotation marks omitted; *Abdullah v.*
3 *U.S. Security Associates, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2013) 731 F.3d 952, 958–959.) “[I]t is the employer’s obligation
4 to determine whether the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved before requiring
5 an employee to take an on-duty meal period.” (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.*, *supra*, 5 Cal.App.5th at
6 p. 946.)

7 46. Here, the Class Members were never asked to sign any enforceable document agreeing
8 to an on-duty meal period. Moreover, nothing in the nature of their work involved the kind of “external
9 force” that might justify on-duty meal breaks. (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.*, *supra*, 5 Cal.App.5th at
10 p. 945.) Nevertheless, Defendants periodically did not provide compliant off-duty meal periods within
11 the first five hours of work for the Class Members.

12 47. As with rest breaks, meal breaks must be duty-free. (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
13 *Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1035 [“The IWC’s wage orders have long made a meal period’s
14 duty-free nature its defining characteristic.”].) Relinquishing control over employees during meal
15 periods requires that employees be “free to leave the employer’s premises” and be “permitted to attend
16 to personal business.” (*Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, *supra*, 2 Cal.5th at p. 275.) Under
17 Labor Code section 512, if an employer maintains a uniform policy that does not authorize and permit
18 the amount of meal time called for under the law (as specified in the Labor Code and/or applicable
19 IWC Wage Order), “it has violated the wage order and is liable.” (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior*
20 *Court*, *supra*, 53 Cal.4th at p. 1033.)

21 48. During the applicable statutory periods here, the Class Members were periodically
22 denied legally-compliant and timely off-duty meal periods of at least thirty minutes due to Defendants’
23 unlawful meal period policy and practices. As a result of Defendants’ uniform meal period policies and
24 practices, the Class Members were often not permitted to take compliant first meal periods before the
25 end of the fifth hour of work. The Class Members were also periodically not permitted to take second
26 meal periods for shifts in excess of ten hours. Defendants thus violated Labor Code section 512 and
27 the Applicable Wage Orders by failing to advise, authorize, or permit the Class Members to receive
28 thirty-minute, off-duty meal periods within the first five hours of their shifts.

1 49. Labor Code section 226.7 provides that “[a]n employer shall not require an employee
2 to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or
3 applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.” (Lab. Code, § 226.7,
4 subd. (b).) Labor Code section 226.7, subdivision (c), and the Applicable Wage Orders further obligate
5 employers to pay employees one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation
6 for each workday that the meal period is not provided. (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c); Cal. Code of
7 Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160 [“If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance
8 with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay
9 at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not
10 provided.”].) The “regular rate” for these purposes must factor in all nondiscretionary payments for
11 work performed by the employee, including non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and other forms
12 of wage payments exceeding the employees’ base hourly rate. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*
13 (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 878.)

14 50. Accordingly, for each day that the Class Members did not receive compliant meal
15 periods, they were and are entitled to receive meal period premiums pursuant to Labor Code section
16 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Orders. Defendants, however, failed to pay the Class Members
17 applicable meal period premiums for many workdays that the employees did not receive a compliant
18 meal period. Thus, Defendants have violated Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage
19 Orders.

20 51. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to recover, on behalf of himself and other non-
21 exempt employees, meal period premiums and penalties.

22 **E. UNTIMELY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT**

23 52. Labor Code section 204 expressly requires employers who pay employees on a weekly,
24 biweekly, or semimonthly basis to pay all wages “not more than seven calendar days following the
25 close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a), makes employers who violate
26 Labor Code section 204 subject to a penalty of:

27 “(1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to
28 pay each employee.

1 “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two
2 hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25
3 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.” (Lab. Code, § 210, subd.
4 (a).)

5 53. Notably, the penalty provided by Labor Code section 210 is “[i]n addition to, and
6 entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article” (Lab. Code, § 210,
7 subd. (a).)

8 54. Due to Defendants’ failure to pay the Class Members the wages described above, along
9 with rest and meal break premiums, Defendants failed to timely pay the Class Members within seven
10 calendar days following the close of payroll in accordance with Labor Code section 204 on a regular
11 and consistent basis. (See *Parson v. Golden State FC, LLC* (N.D. Cal., May 2, 2016, No. 16-CV-00405-
12 JST) 2016 WL 1734010, at p. *3–5, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58299 [finding that a failure to pay rest
13 period premiums can support claims under Labor Code sections 203 and 204].)

14 **F. UNTIMELY WAGES AT SEPARATION**

15 55. Labor Code section 203 provides “if an employer willfully fails to pay . . . any wages
16 of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty”
17 for up to thirty days. (Lab. Code § 203; *Mamika v. Barca* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 487, 492.) As a result
18 of Defendants’ failure to pay the Class Members for the wages described above, along with rest and
19 meal break premiums, Defendants violated and continue to violate Labor Code section 203.

20 56. Due to Defendants’ faulty pay policies, those Class Members whose employment with
21 Defendants concluded were not compensated for each and every hour worked at the appropriate rate.
22 Defendants have failed to pay formerly-employed Class Members whose sums were certain at the time
23 of termination within at least seventy-two hours of their resignation and have failed to pay those sums
24 for thirty days thereafter.

25 **G. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

26 57. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 2802, which
27 states that “an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or losses
28 incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her

1 obedience to the directions of the employer.” The purpose of this section is to “prevent employers from
2 passing along their operating expenses onto their employees.” (*Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.*
3 (2007) 42 Cal.4th 554, 562.)

4 58. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 2804, which
5 states that “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits
6 of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his
7 personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State.”

8 59. Thus, the Class Members were and are entitled to reimbursement for the expenses they
9 incurred during the course of their duties. The duty to reimburse even extends to the use of equipment
10 the employee may already own and would be required to pay for anyway. (*Cochran v. Schwan’s Home*
11 *Serv., Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1144 [“The threshold question in this case is this: Does an
12 employer always have to reimburse an employee for the reasonable expense of the mandatory use of a
13 personal cell phone, or is the reimbursement obligation limited to the situation in which the employee
14 incurred an extra expense that he or she would not have otherwise incurred absent the job? The answer
15 is that reimbursement is always required. Otherwise, the employer would receive a windfall because it
16 would be passing its operating expenses on to the employee.”].)

17 60. Here, Defendants failed to fully reimburse the Class Members for necessary
18 expenditures incurred as a direct consequence and requirement of performing their job duties, including
19 the costs associated with their personal cell phone and mileage they required to perform their work.
20 Consequently, Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 2802.

21 H. WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS

22 61. Defendants also failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with
23 Labor Code sections 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (5), and (9). Labor Code section 226, subdivision
24 (a), obligates employers, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment to furnish an itemized wage
25 statement in writing showing:

- 26 (1) The gross wages earned;
- 27 (2) The total hours worked by the employee;
- 28

- 1 (3) The number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if
2 the employee is paid on a piece rate basis;
- 3 (4) All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of
4 the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- 5 (5) The net wages earned;
- 6 (6) The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- 7 (7) The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
8 security number or an employee identification number other than a social
9 security number;
- 10 (8) The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
- 11 (9) All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
12 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
13 employee.

14 62. Due to Defendants' failure to pay the Class Members properly as described above, the
15 wage statements issued do not indicate the correct amount of gross wages earned, total hours worked,
16 or the net wages earned, or the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
17 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Thus, Defendants have violated Labor
18 Code section 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (5), and (9).

19 63. In addition to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Defendants also knowingly and
20 intentionally failed to provide the Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements in violation
21 of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e). Defendants knew that they were not providing the Class
22 Members with wage statements required by California law but nevertheless failed to correct their
23 unlawful practices and policies. (See *Garnett v. ADT LLC* (E.D. Cal. 2015) 139 F.Supp.3d 1121, 1134
24 [finding the defendant knowingly and intentionally violated Labor Code section 226 because the
25 "[d]efendant knew that it was not providing total hours worked to plaintiff or other employees paid on
26 commission" even though it believed that employees paid solely on commission or commission and
27 salary "are exempt and therefore we do not record hours on a wage statement."].)
28

1 **I. RECORDKEEPING VIOLATIONS**

2 64. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), requires employers to keep an accurate record
3 of, among other things, all hours worked by employees. Labor Code section 226.3 provides, in pertinent
4 part, as follows:

5 “Any employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a
6 civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per
7 violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee
8 for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to
9 provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the records
10 required in subdivision (a) of Section 226. The civil penalties provided for in
11 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.” (Lab. Code, §
12 226.3, emphasis added.)

13 65. Likewise, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), requires every employer, including
14 Defendants, to:

15 “Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which
16 employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by
17 and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any
18 applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or
19 establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established
20 for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not
21 less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from
22 maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis,
23 piece-rate units earned.” (Lab. Code, § 1174, subd. (d), emphasis added.)

24 66. As explained in detail above, Defendants failed to provide the Class Members with
25 accurate itemized wage statements. Defendants did so, in part, because they failed to accurately track
26 hours worked by the Class Members. Defendants have thus failed to keep accurate records of the “total
27 hours worked by the employee[s]” in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), and are
28

1 therefore subject to the penalties provided by Labor Code section 226.3. These penalties are “in
2 addition to any other penalty provided by law.” (Lab. Code, § 226.3.)

3 67. The failure to accurately track hours worked also resulted in a failure of Defendants to
4 keep a record of all “payroll records showing the hours worked daily by” Defendants’ employees,
5 including Plaintiff and the other Class Members, in violation of Labor Code section 1174, subdivision
6 (d).

7 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

8 68. As mentioned above, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the Class
9 Members pursuant to section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

10 69. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all
11 members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the class is unknown to Plaintiff
12 at this time; however, it is estimated that the number of Class Members is greater than 100 individuals.
13 The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants’ employment
14 records.

15 70. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of**
16 **Interest:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated
17 non-exempt employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members
18 including, without limitation to:

19 A. Whether Defendants’ pay policies/practices resulted in a failure to pay the Class
20 Members for all hours worked, including all minimum wages;

21 B. Whether Defendants’ pay policies/practices resulted in a failure to pay the Class
22 Members for all required overtime wages at the Class Members’ regular rate of pay;

23 C. Whether Defendants’ rest period policies and practices afforded legally
24 compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

25 D. Whether Defendants’ meal period policies and practices afforded legally
26 compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

27 E. Whether Defendants maintained accurate employment records;

28 F. Whether Defendants timely paid all wages during employment;

1 G. Whether Defendants timely paid all wages earned and unpaid at separation;

2 H. Whether Defendants indemnified their employees for all necessary business
3 expenditures;

4 I. Whether Defendants furnished legally-compliant wage statements to the Class
5 Members pursuant to Labor Code section 226; and

6 J. Whether Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and the Applicable Wage
7 Orders amounted to a violation of California's UCL.

8 71. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact
9 predominate over questions that affect only individual Class Members. The common questions of law
10 set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' uniform policies and practices
11 applicable to each individual class member, such as Defendants' uniform policy and practice of failing
12 to pay for all hours worked, Defendants' uniform policies and practices which failed to provide
13 compliant rest periods, Defendants' uniform policies and practices which failed to provide compliant
14 meal periods, Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and others. As such,
15 the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class
16 member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

17 72. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Class Members
18 because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the
19 statute(s) of limitation applicable to each cause of action pleaded in this complaint. As alleged herein,
20 Plaintiff, like the other Class Members, was deprived of minimum, regular, and overtime wages
21 because of Defendants' unlawful timekeeping policies and practices, was deprived of rest periods and
22 premium wages in lieu thereof, was deprived of meal periods and premium wages in lieu thereof, was
23 subject to Defendants' uniform rest period policies and practices, was subject to Defendants' uniform
24 meal period policies and practices, was not provided accurate itemized wage statements, was not paid
25 all wages in full and on time, , and was subject to other similar policies and practices to which the Class
26 Members were subject.

27 73. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to
28 represent fairly and adequately the interests of the Class Members. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are

1 ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the Class Members and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's
2 attorneys have prosecuted numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal court in the past
3 and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class Members.

4 74. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an
5 important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California.
6 These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers
7 who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior
8 economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of
9 this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and the Class Members make the class action
10 format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each
11 employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an
12 unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of
13 each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

14 75. Moreover, requiring each Class Member to pursue an individual remedy would also
15 discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action
16 against their former or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent
17 damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the
18 individual Class Members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying
19 verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual Class Members against Defendants herein, and
20 which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants or legal
21 determinations with respect to individual Class Members which would, as a practical matter, be
22 dispositive of the interest of the other Class Members not parties to adjudications or which would
23 substantially impair or impede the ability of the Class Members to protect their interests.

24 76. Further, the claims of the individual Class Members are not sufficiently large to warrant
25 vigorous individual prosecution considering the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As
26 such, the Class Members identified above are maintainable as a class under section 382 of the Code of
27 Civil Procedure.
28

1 **VI. CAUSES OF ACTION**

2 **First Cause of Action**

3 *Failure to Pay All Minimum Wages*

4 *(Against All Defendants)*

5 77. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

6 78. Section 4 of the Applicable Wage Orders and Labor Code section 1197 establish the
7 right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law. (Lab.
8 Code, § 1197; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.) Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a),
9 and 1194.2, subdivision (a), provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage
10 as required by Labor Code section 1197 may recover the unpaid balance, together with attorneys' fees
11 and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid wages and interest
12 accrued thereon.

13 79. Here, Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of the
14 law during the relevant statutory periods. Plaintiff and the other Class Members were not compensated
15 for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of
16 Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and the Applicable Wage
17 Orders.

18 80. Labor Code section 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under
19 conditions that the IWC Wage Orders prohibit. Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2,
20 subdivision (a), provide that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage
21 is liable to pay those employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages
22 in an amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

23 81. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged herein,
24 Plaintiff and the other Class Members have sustained economic damages, including but not limited to
25 unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and they are entitled to recover
26 economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief because of Defendants'
27 violations of the Labor Code and Applicable Wage Orders.
28

82. Defendants' practices and policies regarding illegal employee compensation are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the other Class Members in a civil action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages, liquidated damages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code sections 204, 218.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

Second Cause of Action

Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages

(Against All Defendants)

83. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

84. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all overtime wages earned pursuant to Labor Code section 1194 and the Applicable Wage Orders. Defendants caused Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work overtime hours but did not compensate them at one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for such hours in accordance with California law. Likewise, Defendants caused Plaintiff and the other Class Members to work double-time hours but did not compensate them at twice their regular rate of pay for such hours in accordance with California law.

85. Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of California law. This unlawful conduct includes but is not limited to Defendants' uniform and unlawful pay policies and practices of failing to accurately record all the time that non-exempt employees were under the supervision and control of Defendants. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and allow Plaintiff and the other Class Members to recover in a civil action the unpaid amount of overtime premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code section 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, the Applicable Wage Orders, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

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

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

92. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal period violations, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the Applicable Wage Orders and Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, and Civil Code sections 3287, subdivision (b), and 3289. (See Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.)

Fifth Cause of Action

Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records

(Against All Defendants)

93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

94. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), an employer shall keep at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and wages paid to employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records must be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than two years.

95. Labor Code section 1174.5 imposes a civil penalty of \$500 for an employer's failure to maintain accurate and complete records.

96. Defendant has intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete records showing the hours worked daily and wages paid to Plaintiff and the other Class Members. Thus, Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been denied their legal right and protected interest in having available at a central location at the plant or establishment where they are employed, accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, employees at those respective locations pursuant to Labor Code 1174.

Sixth Cause of Action

Failure to Pay Wages Timely during Employment

(Against All Defendants)

97. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

98. Labor Code section 200 provides that “wages” include all amounts for labor performed by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task, pieces, commission basis, or other method of calculation. Labor Code section 204 states that all

1 wages earned by any person in any employment are payable twice during the calendar month and must
2 be paid not more than seven days following the close of the period when the wages were earned. Labor
3 Code section 210, subdivision (a), makes employers who violate Labor Code section 204 subject to a
4 penalty of \$100 for any initial failure to timely pay each employee's full wages and \$200 for each
5 subsequent violation, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld.

6 99. Labor Code section 216 establishes that it is a misdemeanor for any person, with regards
7 to wages due, to "falsely deny the amount or validity thereof, or that the same is due, with intent to
8 secure himself, his employer or other person, any discount upon such indebtedness, or with intent to
9 annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud, the person to whom such indebtedness is due."

10 100. Defendants as a matter of established company policy and procedure in the State of
11 California, scheduled, required, suffered, and/or permitted Plaintiff and the other Class Members, to
12 work without full compensation, to work without legally-compliant off-duty meal periods, to work
13 without legally-compliant off-duty rest periods, and thereby failed to fully pay Plaintiff and the other
14 Class Members within seven days of the close of payroll, as required by law.

15 101. Defendants, as a matter of established company policy and procedure in the State of
16 California, falsely deny they owe Plaintiff and the other Class Members these wages, with the intent of
17 securing for itself a discount upon its indebtedness and/or to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay,
18 and/or defraud Plaintiff and the other Class Members.

19 102. Defendants' pattern, practice, and uniform administration of its corporate policy of
20 illegally denying employees compensation, as described herein, is unlawful and entitles Plaintiff and
21 the other Class Members to recover, pursuant to Labor Code section 218, the unpaid balance of the
22 compensation owed to them in a civil action and any applicable penalties, attorney fees, and interest
23 owed to them pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 and 218.5.

24 **Seventh Cause of Action**

25 *Failure to Pay All Wages Earned and Unpaid at Separation*

26 *(Against All Defendants)*

27 103. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.
28

104. The actionable period for this cause of action is three years prior to the filing of this complaint through the present, and ongoing until the violations are corrected or the class is certified. (*Pineda v. Bank of America, N.A.* (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1389, 1395; *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1094, 1109; Code Civ. Proc., § 338, subd. (a).) Labor Code sections 201 and 202 of the California Labor Code require Defendants to pay all compensation due and owing to its former employees (including the formerly-employed Class Members) during the actionable period for this cause of action at or around the time that their employment is or was terminated, or ended.

105. Section 203 of the Labor Code provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required by Sections 201 and 202, then the employer is liable for penalties in the form of continued compensation up to thirty workdays.

106. Due to Defendants' faulty pay policies, those Class Members whose employment with Defendants has concluded were not compensated for each and every hour worked at the appropriate rate. Defendants have willfully failed to pay those formerly-employed Class Members whose sums were certain at the time of termination within seventy-two hours of their resignation and have failed to pay those sums for thirty days thereafter as required by Labor Code sections 201 through 203.

107. As a result, Defendants are liable to the formerly-employed Class Members for waiting time penalties amounting to thirty days wages for the formerly-employed Class Members pursuant to Labor Code section 203. (See, e.g., DLSE Manual, § 4.3.4 [failure to pay any sort of wages due upon termination entitles an employee to recover waiting time penalties].)

Eighth Cause of Action

Failure to Indemnify All Necessary Business Expenditures

(Against All Defendants)

108. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

109. California Labor Code Section 2802 states that employers must “indemnify” an employee for “all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.” Likewise, Labor Code section 2804 states that “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall

1 not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled
2 under the laws of this State.”

3 110. Here, Plaintiff and the other Class Members paid out of pocket for necessary business
4 expenditures incurred as a direct consequence and requirement of performing their job duties, including
5 the costs associated with their personal cell phone and mileage they required to perform their work.
6 Despite knowing that Plaintiff and the other Class Members incurred these necessary business
7 expenses, and requiring Plaintiff and the other Class Members to use such items, Defendants did not
8 reimburse them.

9 111. Thus, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the cost of such
10 necessary business expenses, plus interest from the date each incurred such business expenses, plus
11 fees and costs. (Lab. Code, § 2802, subds. (b), (c).)

12 **Ninth Cause of Action**

13 *Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements*

14 *(Against All Defendants)*

15 112. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

16 113. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), obligates employers, semi-monthly or at the
17 time of each payment to furnish an itemized wage statement in writing showing:

- 18 (1) The gross wages earned;
- 19 (2) The total hours worked by the employee;
- 20 (3) The number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if
21 the employee is paid on a piece rate basis;
- 22 (4) All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of
23 the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- 24 (5) The net wages earned;
- 25 (6) The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- 26 (7) The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
27 security number or an employee identification number other than a social
28 security number;

1 (8) The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and

2 (9) All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
3 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
4 employee.

5 114. As set forth above, Defendants issued and continues to issue wage statements to its non-
6 exempt employees including Plaintiff and the other Class Members that are inadequate under Labor
7 Code section 226, subdivision (a). By failing to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members properly as
8 described above, Defendants failed to include required information on their wage statements, including,
9 but not limited to, the gross wages earned, the net wages earned in violation of Labor Code section
10 226, subdivision (a).

11 115. Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), of the
12 Labor Code was knowing and intentional. (Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (e)).

13 116. As a result of Defendants' issuance of inaccurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff
14 and the other Class Members in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiff and the
15 other Class Members are each entitled to recover an initial penalty of \$50, and subsequent penalties of
16 \$100, up to an amount not exceeding an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per Plaintiff and per each Class
17 Member from Defendants pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), along with costs and
18 reasonable attorneys' fees.

19 **Tenth Cause of Action**

20 *Violations of California's Unfair Competition Law*

21 *(Against All Defendants)*

22 117. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

23 118. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business
24 practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200 through
25 17210, by committing the unlawful acts described above. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and
26 unlawful business practices deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiff and the other Class Members of
27 compensation to which they are legally entitled. These practices constitute unfair and unlawful
28 competition and provide an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are

1 currently employing workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and
2 hour laws.

3 119. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and unlawful conduct alleged herein,
4 Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the Class Members, seeks full restitution of monies, as necessary
5 and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by
6 Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17208.

7 120. The acts complained of herein occurred within the four years prior to the initiation of
8 this action and are continuing into the present and ongoing.

9 121. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this Court action to
10 protect his interests and those of the Class Members, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf
11 of Defendants' current non-exempt employees and to enforce important rights affecting the public
12 interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiff
13 is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

14 **VII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15 122. Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury of Plaintiff's and the Class Members' claims
16 against Defendants.

17 **VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought
19 against Defendants, as follows:

- 20 1. For an order certifying the proposed class;
- 21 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the class;
- 22 3. For an order appointing Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the class;
- 23 4. For the failure to pay all minimum wages, compensatory, consequential, general, and
24 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2,
25 1197, and others as may be applicable;
- 26 5. For the failure to pay all overtime wages, compensatory, consequential, general, and
27 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194,
28 1198, and others as may be applicable;

- 1 **6.** For the failure to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums,
2 compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant
3 to Labor Code section 226.7;
- 4 **7.** For the failure to provide meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums,
5 compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant
6 to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512;
- 7 **8.** For the failure to maintain accurate employment records, penalties pursuant to Labor
8 Code sections 226.3, 1174.5, and others that may be applicable;
- 9 **9.** For the failure to pay wages timely during employment, the unpaid balance of the
10 compensation owed to Plaintiff and the other Class Members and any applicable
11 penalties owed to them pursuant to Labor Code section 210;
- 12 **10.** For the failure to pay all wages earned and unpaid at separation, statutory waiting time
13 penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 through 203, for the Class Members who
14 quit or were fired in an amount equal to their daily wage multiplied by thirty days, as
15 may be proven;
- 16 **11.** For the failure to indemnify all necessary business expenditures, all unreimbursed
17 business expenses, and interest thereon, that are owed, pursuant to Labor Code section
18 2802, and attorney fees, pursuant to Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (c);
- 19 **12.** For the violations of California's Unfair Competition Law, restitution to Plaintiff and
20 the other Class Members of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by
21 Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation
22 of Business and Professions Code sections 17200 through 17210;
- 23 **13.** Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6
24 and Civil Code sections 3287 and 3289;
- 25 **14.** On all causes of action for which attorneys' fees may be available, for attorneys' fees
26 and costs as provided by Labor Code sections 218.5, 226, Code of Civil Procedure
27 section 1021.5, and others as may be applicable;
- 28

1 **15.** For an order enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents, servants, and
2 employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from acting in
3 derogation of any rights or duties adumbrated in this complaint; and

4 **16.** For such other and further relief, this Court may deem just and proper.

5 Dated: July 15, 2024

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.



KYLE D. SMITH

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

EXHIBIT 2

Anticipated Amended Complaint in
Lord v. Brooks Technology Group LLC
(Orange Cnty. Sup. Ct., No. 30-2024-01412325-
CU-OE-CXC)

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.
Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218)
jm@melmedlaw.com
Kyle D. Smith (SBN 280489)
ks@melmedlaw.com
1801 Century Park East, Suite 850
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: (310) 824-3828
Fax: (310) 862-6851

Attorneys for Plaintiff, the Putative Class, and the Aggrieved Employees

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

GWINNON LORD, an individual, on behalf of
himself, the State of California, as a private
attorney general, and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BROOKS TECHNOLOGY GROUP LLC, a
Nevada Limited Liability Company; and DOES
1 TO 50,

Defendants.

Case Number: 30-2024-01412325-CU-OE-CXC

**First Amended Class and Representative
Action Complaint For:**

1. Failure to Pay All Minimum Wages,
2. Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages,
3. Failure to Provide Rest Periods and Pay Missed Rest Period Premiums,
4. Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Pay Missed Meal Period Premiums,
5. Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records,
6. Failure to Pay Wages Timely during Employment,
7. Failure to Pay All Wages Earned and Unpaid at Separation,
8. Failure to Indemnify All Necessary Business Expenditures,
9. Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements,
10. Failure to Pay Separately and Hourly in Violation of Labor Code Section 226.2,

11. Violations of California’s Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 17200–17210), and
12. Penalties Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) for Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2804, and Other Provisions of the Labor Code.

Demand for Jury Trial

Plaintiff Gwinnon Lord (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself, the State of California, as a private attorney general, and all other similarly situated employees within the State of California, complains and alleges of defendants Brooks Technology Group LLC and Does 1 to 50 (collectively, “Defendants”), and each of them, as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a class action complaint brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

2. The “Class Period” as used herein, is defined as the period from July 16, 2020, and continuing into the present and ongoing. Defendants’ violations of California’s laws as described more fully below have been ongoing throughout the Class Period and are still ongoing.

3. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of himself and the following class: *All individuals who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the Class Period* (the “Class Members”). (Code Civ. Proc., § 382.)

4. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the Class Members, as a class action, against Defendants for:

- A. Failure to pay all minimum wages,
- B. Failure to pay all overtime wages,

- 1 C. Failure to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums,
2 D. Failure to provide meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums,
3 E. Failure to maintain accurate employment records,
4 F. Failure to pay wages timely during employment,
5 G. Failure to pay all wages earned and unpaid at separation,
6 H. Failure to indemnify all necessary business expenditures,
7 I. Failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements,
8 J. Failure to pay separately and hourly in violation of Labor Code section 226.2,
9 and
10 K. Violations of California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) (Bus. & Prof.
11 Code, §§ 17200–17210).

12 5. This action is also a representative action brought pursuant to the California Labor Code
13 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), codified at California Labor Code sections 2698
14 through 2699.6.

15 6. The “PAGA Period” as used herein, is defined as the period from July 16, 2023, and
16 continuing into the present and ongoing.

17 7. This PAGA action is brought on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California as private
18 attorney general, and on behalf of the following aggrieved employees: *All individuals who are or were*
19 *employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the PAGA Period* (the
20 “Aggrieved Employees”).

21 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the California Industrial
22 Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders applicable to the facts of this case are IWC Wage Orders
23 4-2001 and/or 16-2001 (the “Applicable Wage Orders”) and possibly others that may be applicable.
24 (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.) Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the
25 definition of “Applicable Wage Orders” with greater specificity or add additional IWC Wage Orders
26 if additional applicable wage orders are discovered in litigation.

1 **II. JURISDICTION & VENUE**

2 9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein
3 pursuant to Article VI, section 10, of the California Constitution and Code of Civil Procedure section
4 410.10 because this is a civil action in which the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest, exceeds
5 \$25,000, and because each cause of action asserted arises under the laws of the State of California or
6 is subject to adjudication in the courts of the State of California.

7 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants have caused
8 injuries in the County of Orange and the State of California through their acts, and by their violation
9 of the California Labor Code and California state common law. Defendants transact millions of dollars
10 of business within the State of California. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have an
11 agent or agents within the County of Orange, and/or otherwise are found within the County of Orange,
12 and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

13 11. Venue as to Defendants is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to section 395 of the
14 Code of Civil Procedure. Defendants operate within California and do business within Orange County,
15 California. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and all of Defendants’
16 employees identified above within Orange County and surrounding counties where Defendants may
17 remotely operate.

18 12. This matter is not appropriate for removal under the Class Action Fairness Act (28
19 U.S.C. § 1332) as the amount in controversy for Plaintiff’s and the Class Members’ claims, in
20 aggregate, is less than \$5 million. Additionally, all the allegations herein occurred in the State of
21 California. As such, even if the amount in controversy did exceed \$5 million this matter would still not
22 be appropriate for removal under the “local controversy” exception to the Class Action Fairness Act.
23 (28 U.S.C. § 1332, subd. (d)(4)(A).)

24 **III. THE PARTIES**

25 **A. PLAINTIFF**

26 13. At all relevant times, Plaintiff, who is over the age of 18, was and currently is a citizen
27 of California residing in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt hourly
28 employee.

1 14. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following class pursuant to
2 section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure as follows: *All individuals who are or were employed by*
3 *Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the Class Period* (the “Class Members”).

4 15. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of himself and the State of California, as a
5 private attorney general, and on behalf of the following group of aggrieved employees: *All individuals*
6 *who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California during the PAGA*
7 *Period* (the “Aggrieved Employees”).

8 16. The Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees, at all times pertinent hereto, are or
9 were employees of Defendants during the relevant statutory period.

10 **B. DEFENDANTS**

11 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants were authorized
12 to and doing business in Orange County and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff, the other
13 Aggrieved Employees, and the other Class Members during the applicable statutory periods. Plaintiff,
14 the other Aggrieved Employees, and the other Class Members were, and are, subject to Defendants’
15 policies and/or practices complained of herein and have been deprived of the rights guaranteed to them
16 by: California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174,
17 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2804, and others that may be
18 applicable; California Business and Professions Code sections 17200 through 17210 (“UCL”); and the
19 Applicable Wage Orders (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160).

20 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the Class
21 Period and PAGA Period, Defendants did (and continue to do) business in the State of California,
22 County of Orange.

23 19. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or
24 corporate, of the defendants sued herein as Does 1 to 50, inclusive, and for that reason, said defendants
25 are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to amend this
26 complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and
27 thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate, were
28 responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff,

1 the other Aggrieved Employees, and the other Class Members to be subject to the unlawful employment
2 practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

3 20. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
4 herein, Defendants were and/or are the employers of Plaintiff, the other Aggrieved Employees, and the
5 other Class Members. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing
6 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants. Furthermore, the
7 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, representatives, and employees of each and every one
8 of the other Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of
9 said agency, representation, and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned,
10 or otherwise ratified every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

11 21. Plaintiff is further informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times
12 mentioned herein, that Defendants, and each of them, are the alter egos of one another and that there
13 existed and now exists a unity of interest and ownership between them such that the individuality and
14 separateness of each of them has ceased. Plaintiff is further informed, and believes, and thereon alleges,
15 that at all times mentioned herein, that Defendants, and each of them, have been and now are mere
16 shells and naked frameworks that their principal uses for the conduct of that Defendant's own business,
17 property, and affairs, for which Defendants, and each of them, have concealed and misrepresented their
18 identities as the entities responsible for their ownership, management, and financial interests.

19 22. Plaintiff is further informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times
20 mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture,
21 partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of and in pursuance of said
22 joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and
23 thereon alleges, that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff, the other
24 Aggrieved Employees, and the other Class Members.

25 **IV. COMMON FACTS & ALLEGATIONS**

26 23. Plaintiff and the other Class Members (collectively, the "Class Members") are, and were
27 at all relevant times, employed by the Defendants within the State of California.
28

1 24. Likewise, Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees (collectively, the “Aggrieved
2 Employees”) are, and were at all relevant times, employed by the Defendants within the State of
3 California.

4 25. The Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees are, and were, at all relevant times,
5 non-exempt employees for the purposes of minimum wages, overtime, rest breaks, meal periods, and
6 the other claims alleged in this complaint.

7 26. Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within the statutory Class Period
8 and PAGA Period, working as an hourly, non-exempt field inspector for Defendants. Plaintiff’s duties
9 included driving to various assigned locations, documenting telephone poles and vegetation,
10 documenting GPS locations, and documenting any additional pertinent information during inspections.

11 **A. MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

12 27. Labor Code section 1197 requires employees to be paid at least the minimum wage fixed
13 by the IWC, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. Similarly, Labor Code
14 section 1194 entitles “any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage . . . to recover in a
15 civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage.” Likewise, the Applicable
16 Wage Orders also obligate employers to pay each employee minimum wages for all hours worked.
17 (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.) Labor Code section 1198 makes unlawful the employment
18 of an employee under conditions that the IWC Wage Orders prohibit.

19 28. These minimum wage standards apply to each hour that employees work. Therefore, an
20 employer’s failure to pay for any particular time worked by an employee is unlawful, even if averaging
21 an employee’s total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above
22 minimum wage. (*Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324.)

23 29. Here, Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of the
24 law during the relevant statutory periods. The Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were not
25 compensated for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control
26 of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and the Applicable
27 Wage Orders. Among other violations, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were subject
28

1 to the control of Defendants while off-the-clock and did not receive minimum wage for each hour
2 worked.

3 30. Additionally, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages
4 for all hours worked due to Defendants' uniform payroll policies and practices that unfairly rounded
5 employees' wages to the detriment of the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees. This rounding
6 policy routinely failed to capture the entirety of the hours the Class Members and the Aggrieved
7 Employees worked and was structured in a way that in favored underpayment. (See *See's Candy Shops,*
8 *Inc. v. Superior Court* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 889, 907.) As a result, the Class Members and the
9 Aggrieved Employees suffered periodic shortages in the hours for which they were compensated. This
10 uncompensated time violated California's requirement that employees be compensated for all hours
11 worked. As a result of this practice, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were not
12 compensated their minimum wages for all hours worked.

13 31. Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2, subdivision (a), provide that an
14 employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees
15 the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages
16 due and interest thereon.

17 32. When employees, such as the Class Members, are not paid for all hours worked under
18 Labor Code section 1194, they are entitled to recover minimum wages for the time which they received
19 no compensation. (See *Sillah v. Command International Security Services* (N.D. Cal. 2015) 154
20 F.Supp.3d 891 [employees suing for failure to pay overtime could recover liquidated damages under
21 Labor Code section 1194.2 if they also showed they were paid less than minimum wage].)

22 33. Labor Code section 1197.1 authorizes employees who are paid less than the minimum
23 wage fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order of the IWC, a civil penalty, among other
24 damages, as follows:

- 25 (1) "For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred
26 dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for
27 which the employee is underpaid."
28

1 (2) “For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two
2 hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
3 period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the
4 initial violation is intentionally committed.” (Lab. Code, § 1197.1, subd.
5 (a).)

6 34. As set forth above, Defendants failed to fully compensate the Class Members and the
7 Aggrieved Employees for all minimum wages. Accordingly, the Class Members are entitled to recover
8 liquidated damages for violations of Labor Code section 1197.1.

9 35. Based upon these same factual allegations, the Class Members are likewise entitled to
10 penalties under Labor Code sections 1199.

11 **B. OVERTIME VIOLATIONS**

12 36. Labor Code section 510 requires employers to compensate employees who work more
13 than eight hours in one workday, forty hours in a workweek, and for the first eight hours worked on
14 the seventh consecutive day no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.
15 (Lab. Code, § 510, subd. (a).) Further, Labor Code section 510 obligates employers to compensate
16 employees at no less than twice the regular rate of pay when an employee works more than twelve
17 hours in a day or more than eight hours on the seventh consecutive day of work. (Lab. Code, § 510,
18 subd. (a).) These rules are also reflected in the Applicable Wage Orders.

19 37. In accordance with Labor Code section 1194 and the Applicable Wage Orders, the Class
20 Members and the Aggrieved Employees could not then agree and cannot now agree to work for a lesser
21 wage than the amount provided by Labor Code sections 510 or the Applicable Wage Orders.

22 38. Here, Defendants violated their duty to accurately and completely compensate the Class
23 Members and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime worked. The Class Members and the
24 Aggrieved Employees periodically worked hours that entitled them to overtime compensation under
25 the law but were not fully compensated for those hours.

26 39. Moreover, during the relevant statutory periods, Defendants had a policy and practice
27 of failing to pay overtime wages at the proper rate when it actually paid overtime. Specifically, when
28 Defendants paid overtime wages to the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees, Defendants

1 failed to include all compensation when calculating the regular rate of pay used in overtime calculations
2 and when paying overtime.

3 40. For instance, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees would often receive,
4 along with their hourly rates of pay for their working hours, additional remuneration and/or non-
5 discretionary bonus pay. Defendants, however, calculated the regular rate of pay for the Class Members
6 and the Aggrieved Employees without factoring into the regular rate of pay all other non-hourly pay
7 earnings received during the pay period. As a result, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees
8 were underpaid overtime wages when they worked in excess of eight hours in any workday and/or forty
9 hours in a workweek when such additional forms of remuneration were earned. By its practice of
10 periodically requiring the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight
11 hours in a workday and/or forty hours in a workweek without compensating them at the rate of one and
12 one-half (1½) their regular rate of pay, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code
13 sections 510, 1194, and 1199.

14 41. These actions were and are in clear violation of California's overtime laws as set forth
15 in Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1199, and the Applicable Wage Orders. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8,
16 §§ 11040, 11160.) As a result of Defendants' faulty policies and practices, the Class Members and the
17 Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for all hours worked or paid accurate overtime
18 compensation.

19 C. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

20 42. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Orders, Defendants
21 were and are required to provide the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees with compensated,
22 duty-free rest periods of not less than ten minutes for every major fraction of four hours worked. Under
23 the Applicable Wage Orders, an employer must authorize and permit all employees to take ten minute
24 duty free rest periods for every major fraction of four hours worked. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§
25 11040, 11160.)

26 43. Likewise, Labor Code section 226.7 provides that "[a]n employer shall not require an
27 employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute,
28 or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission" (Lab. Code, §

1 226.7, subd. (b).) Labor Code section 226.7 also provides that employers must pay their employees one
2 additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate for each workday that a “meal or rest or recovery
3 period is not provided.” (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c).) The “regular rate” for these purposes must
4 factor in all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by the employee, including non-
5 discretionary bonuses, commissions, and other forms of wage payments exceeding the employees’ base
6 hourly rate. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 878.) Thus, the Wage
7 Orders set when and for how long the rest period must take place and the Labor Code establishes that
8 violations of the IWC Wage Orders are unlawful and sets forth the premium pay employer must pay
9 their employees when employers fail to provide rest periods.

10 44. The California Supreme Court has held that, during required rest periods, “employers
11 must relieve their employees of all duties and relinquish any control over how employees spend their
12 break time.” (*Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 260.) Relinquishing
13 control over employees during rest periods requires that employees be “free to leave the employer’s
14 premises” and be “permitted to attend to personal business.” (*Id.* at p. 275.) The *Brinker* Court
15 explained in the context of rest breaks that employer liability attaches from adopting an unlawful
16 policy:

17 “An employer is required to authorize and permit the amount of rest break time
18 called for under the wage order for its industry. If it does not—if, for example,
19 it adopts a uniform policy authorizing and permitting only one rest break for
20 employees working a seven-hour shift when two are required—it has violated
21 the wage order and is liable.” (*Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53
22 Cal.4th 1004, 1033.)

23 45. Here, Defendants periodically did not permit the Class Members and the Aggrieved
24 Employees to take compliant duty-free rest breaks, free from Defendants’ control as required by Labor
25 Code section 226.7, the Applicable Wage Orders, and applicable precedent. (See *Augustus v. ABM*
26 *Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269 [concluding that “during rest periods employers must
27 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time.”].) At all
28 relevant times, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were periodically not provided with

1 legally-compliant and timely rest periods of at least ten minutes for each four hour work period, or
2 major fraction thereof due to Defendants’ unlawful rest period policies/practices. The Class Members
3 and the Aggrieved Employees were often expected and required to continue working through rest
4 periods to meet the expectations Defendants and finish the workday. In some cases when the Class
5 Members and the Aggrieved Employees worked more than ten hours in a shift, Defendants failed to
6 authorize and/or permit a third mandated rest period. As a result, the Class Members and the Aggrieved
7 Employees were periodically unable to take compliant rest periods.

8 46. In such cases where Defendants did not offer the Class Members and the Aggrieved
9 Employees the opportunity to receive a compliant off-duty rest period, “the court may not conclude
10 employees voluntarily chose to skip those breaks.” (*Alberts v. Aurora Behavioral Health Care* (2015)
11 241 Cal.App.4th 388, 410 (2015) [“If an employer fails to provide legally compliant meal or rest
12 breaks, the court may not conclude employees voluntarily chose to skip those breaks.”]; *Brinker Rest.*
13 *Corp. v. Superior Court, supra*, 53 Cal.4th at p. 1033 [“No issue of waiver ever arises for a rest break
14 that was required by law but never authorized; if a break is not authorized, an employee has no
15 opportunity to decline to take it.”].)

16 47. In addition to failing to authorize and permit compliant rest periods, the Class Members
17 and the Aggrieved Employees were not compensated with one hour’s worth of pay at their regular rate
18 of compensation when they were not provided with a compliant rest period in accordance with Labor
19 Code section 226.7, subdivision (c). Thus, Defendants have violated Labor Code section 226.7 and the
20 Applicable Wage Orders.

21 48. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to recover, on behalf of himself and other non-
22 exempt employees, rest period premiums and penalties.

23 **D. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS**

24 49. Labor Code section 512 and the Applicable Wage Orders require employers to provide
25 employees with a thirty-minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal period within the first five hours of
26 work. (Lab. Code, § 512, subd. (a) [“An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
27 more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30
28 minutes”]; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160 [“No employer shall employ any person

1 for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes”].)
2 Additionally, an employee who works more than ten hours per day is entitled to receive a second thirty-
3 minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal period. (Lab. Code, § 512, subd. (a) [“An employer shall not
4 employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee
5 with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes”].)

6 50. “An on-duty meal period is permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
7 employee from being relieved of all duty and the parties agree in writing to an on-duty paid meal
8 break.” (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.* (2016) 5 Cal.App.5th 926, 932.) The written agreement must
9 include a provision allowing the employee to revoke it at any time. (*Ibid.*) Generally, the California
10 Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (“DLSE”) and courts
11 have “found that the nature of the work exception applies: (1) where the work has some particular
12 external force that requires the employee to be on duty at all times, and (2) where the employee is the
13 sole employee of a particular employer.” (*Id.* at p. 945, internal quotation marks omitted; *Abdullah v.*
14 *U.S. Security Associates, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2013) 731 F.3d 952, 958–959.) “[I]t is the employer’s obligation
15 to determine whether the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved before requiring
16 an employee to take an on-duty meal period.” (*Lubin v. The Wackenhut Corp.*, *supra*, 5 Cal.App.5th at
17 p. 946.)

18 51. Here, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were never asked to sign any
19 enforceable document agreeing to an on-duty meal period. Moreover, nothing in the nature of their
20 work involved the kind of “external force” that might justify on-duty meal breaks. (*Lubin v. The*
21 *Wackenhut Corp.*, *supra*, 5 Cal.App.5th at p. 945.) Nevertheless, Defendants periodically did not
22 provide compliant off-duty meal periods within the first five hours of work for the Class Members and
23 the Aggrieved Employees.

24 52. As with rest breaks, meal breaks must be duty-free. (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v.*
25 *Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1035 [“The IWC’s wage orders have long made a meal period’s
26 duty-free nature its defining characteristic.”].) Relinquishing control over employees during meal
27 periods requires that employees be “free to leave the employer’s premises” and be “permitted to attend
28 to personal business.” (*Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, *supra*, 2 Cal.5th at p. 275.) Under

1 Labor Code section 512, if an employer maintains a uniform policy that does not authorize and permit
2 the amount of meal time called for under the law (as specified in the Labor Code and/or applicable
3 IWC Wage Order), “it has violated the wage order and is liable.” (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior*
4 *Court, supra*, 53 Cal.4th at p. 1033.)

5 53. During the applicable statutory periods here, the Class Members and the Aggrieved
6 Employees were periodically denied legally-compliant and timely off-duty meal periods of at least
7 thirty minutes due to Defendants’ unlawful meal period policy and practices. As a result of Defendants’
8 uniform meal period policies and practices, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were
9 often not permitted to take compliant first meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work. The
10 Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were also periodically not permitted to take second meal
11 periods for shifts in excess of ten hours. Defendants thus violated Labor Code section 512 and the
12 Applicable Wage Orders by failing to advise, authorize, or permit the Class Members and the
13 Aggrieved Employees to receive thirty-minute, off-duty meal periods within the first five hours of their
14 shifts.

15 54. Labor Code section 226.7 provides that “[a]n employer shall not require an employee
16 to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or
17 applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.” (Lab. Code, § 226.7,
18 subd. (b).) Labor Code section 226.7, subdivision (c), and the Applicable Wage Orders further obligate
19 employers to pay employees one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation
20 for each workday that the meal period is not provided. (Lab. Code, § 226.7, subd. (c); Cal. Code of
21 Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160 [“If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance
22 with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay
23 at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not
24 provided.”].) The “regular rate” for these purposes must factor in all nondiscretionary payments for
25 work performed by the employee, including non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, and other forms
26 of wage payments exceeding the employees’ base hourly rate. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*
27 (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 878.)
28

1 55. Accordingly, for each day that the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees did
2 not receive compliant meal periods, they were and are entitled to receive meal period premiums
3 pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Orders. Defendants, however, failed
4 to pay the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees applicable meal period premiums for many
5 workdays that the employees did not receive a compliant meal period. Thus, Defendants have violated
6 Labor Code section 226.7 and the Applicable Wage Orders.

7 56. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to recover, on behalf of himself and other non-
8 exempt employees, meal period premiums and penalties.

9 **E. UNTIMELY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT**

10 57. Labor Code section 204 expressly requires employers who pay employees on a weekly,
11 biweekly, or semimonthly basis to pay all wages “not more than seven calendar days following the
12 close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a), makes employers who violate
13 Labor Code section 204 subject to a penalty of:

14 “(1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to
15 pay each employee.

16 “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two
17 hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25
18 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.” (Lab. Code, § 210, subd.
19 (a).)

20 58. Notably, the penalty provided by Labor Code section 210 is “[i]n addition to, and
21 entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article” (Lab. Code, § 210,
22 subd. (a).)

23 59. Due to Defendants’ failure to pay the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees the
24 wages described above, along with rest and meal break premiums, Defendants failed to timely pay the
25 Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees within seven calendar days following the close of payroll
26 in accordance with Labor Code section 204 on a regular and consistent basis. (See *Parson v. Golden*
27 *State FC, LLC* (N.D. Cal., May 2, 2016, No. 16-CV-00405-JST) 2016 WL 1734010, at p. *3–5, 2016
28

1 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58299 [finding that a failure to pay rest period premiums can support claims under
2 Labor Code sections 203 and 204].)

3 **F. UNTIMELY WAGES AT SEPARATION**

4 60. Labor Code section 203 provides “if an employer willfully fails to pay . . . any wages
5 of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty”
6 for up to thirty days. (Lab. Code § 203; *Mamika v. Barca* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 487, 492.) As a result
7 of Defendants’ failure to pay the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees for the wages described
8 above, along with rest and meal break premiums, Defendants violated and continue to violate Labor
9 Code section 203.

10 61. Due to Defendants’ faulty pay policies, those Class Members and Aggrieved Employees
11 whose employment with Defendants concluded were not compensated for each and every hour worked
12 at the appropriate rate. Defendants have failed to pay formerly-employed Class Members and
13 Aggrieved Employees whose sums were certain at the time of termination within at least seventy-two
14 hours of their resignation and have failed to pay those sums for thirty days thereafter.

15 **G. PIECE-RATE VIOLATIONS**

16 62. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 226.2,
17 which states that “[e]mployees shall be compensated for rest and recovery periods and other
18 nonproductive time separate from any piece-rate compensation.” (Lab. Code, § 226.2, subd. (a)(1).)
19 Additionally, Labor Code section 226.2 sets the minimum rate of pay for rest and recovery periods as
20 being “no less than the higher of” either **(1)** the applicable minimum wage, or **(2)** the employees’
21 “average hourly rate determined by dividing the total compensation for the workweek, exclusive of
22 compensation for rest and recovery periods and any premium compensation for overtime, by the total
23 hours worked during the workweek, exclusive of rest and recovery periods.” (Lab. Code, § 226.2, subd.
24 (a)(3)(A).)

25 63. Here, Defendants paid Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees on
26 a piece-rate basis. Defendants incorrectly characterized these wages as a hybrid commission/hourly
27 form of compensation on their wage statements. In substance, however, Plaintiff, the Class Members,
28 and the Aggrieved Employees were often paid exclusively on a piece-rate basis during pay periods in

1 which their piece-rate compensation exceeded the gross hourly pay for their applicable hours worked.
2 Despite this piece-rate form of compensation, Defendants failed to separately compensate Plaintiff, the
3 Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees for their rest and recovery periods and any
4 nonproductive time in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code section 226.2. Likewise, wage
5 statements issued by Defendants to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees do not
6 separately state the total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, or total hours of
7 nonproductive time, or any rate of compensation for either. Accordingly, Defendants' payment
8 practices violate Labor Code Section 226.2.

9 **H. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

10 64. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 2802, which
11 states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or losses
12 incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her
13 obedience to the directions of the employer." The purpose of this section is to "prevent employers from
14 passing along their operating expenses onto their employees." (*Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.*
15 (2007) 42 Cal.4th 554, 562.)

16 65. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code section 2804, which
17 states that "any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits
18 of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his
19 personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State."

20 66. Thus, the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees were and are entitled to
21 reimbursement for the expenses they incurred during the course of their duties. The duty to reimburse
22 even extends to the use of equipment the employee may already own and would be required to pay for
23 anyway. (*Cochran v. Schwan's Home Serv., Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1144 ["The threshold
24 question in this case is this: Does an employer always have to reimburse an employee for the reasonable
25 expense of the mandatory use of a personal cell phone, or is the reimbursement obligation limited to
26 the situation in which the employee incurred an extra expense that he or she would not have otherwise
27 incurred absent the job? The answer is that reimbursement is always required. Otherwise, the employer
28 would receive a windfall because it would be passing its operating expenses on to the employee."].)

1 67. Here, Defendants failed to fully reimburse the Class Members and the Aggrieved
2 Employees for necessary expenditures incurred as a direct consequence and requirement of performing
3 their job duties, including the costs associated with their personal cell phone and mileage they required
4 to perform their work. Consequently, Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 2802.

5 **I. WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**

6 68. Defendants also failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with
7 Labor Code sections 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (5), and (9). Labor Code section 226, subdivision
8 (a), obligates employers, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment to furnish an itemized wage
9 statement in writing showing:

- 10 (1) The gross wages earned;
- 11 (2) The total hours worked by the employee;
- 12 (3) The number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if
13 the employee is paid on a piece rate basis;
- 14 (4) All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of
15 the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- 16 (5) The net wages earned;
- 17 (6) The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- 18 (7) The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
19 security number or an employee identification number other than a social
20 security number;
- 21 (8) The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
- 22 (9) All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
23 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
24 employee.

25 69. Likewise, Labor Code section 226.2 requires wage statements of employees paid on a
26 piece-rate basis to show the total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the total hours of
27 other nonproductive time, the rates of compensation for those times, and the gross wages paid for those
28 periods during the pay period. (Lab. Code, § 226.2, subd. (a)(2).)

1 70. Due to Defendants' failure to pay the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees
2 properly as described above, the wage statements issued do not indicate the correct amount of gross
3 wages earned, total hours worked, the number of piece-rate units earned, the applicable piece rates
4 during the pay period, the total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the total hours of
5 nonproductive time, the rates of compensation for rest and recovery periods, the rates of compensation
6 for nonproductive time, the gross wages paid for rest and recovery periods, the gross wages paid for
7 other nonproductive time, the net wages earned, or the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
8 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Thus, Defendants have
9 violated Labor Code section 226, subdivisions (a)(1), (2), (5), and (9), and Labor Code section 226.2,
10 subdivision (a)(2).

11 71. In addition to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Defendants also knowingly and
12 intentionally failed to provide the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized
13 wage statements in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e). Defendants knew that they
14 were not providing the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements required
15 by California law but nevertheless failed to correct their unlawful practices and policies. (See *Garnett*
16 *v. ADT LLC* (E.D. Cal. 2015) 139 F.Supp.3d 1121, 1134 [finding the defendant knowingly and
17 intentionally violated Labor Code section 226 because the “[d]efendant knew that it was not providing
18 total hours worked to plaintiff or other employees paid on commission” even though it believed that
19 employees paid solely on commission or commission and salary “are exempt and therefore we do not
20 record hours on a wage statement.”].)

21 **J. RECORDKEEPING VIOLATIONS**

22 72. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), requires employers to keep an accurate record
23 of, among other things, all hours worked by employees. Labor Code section 226.3 provides, in pertinent
24 part, as follows:

25 “Any employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a
26 civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per
27 violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee
28 for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to

1 provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the records
2 required in subdivision (a) of Section 226. The civil penalties provided for in
3 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.” (Lab. Code, §
4 226.3, emphasis added.)

5 73. Likewise, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d), requires every employer, including
6 Defendants, to:

7 “Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which
8 employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by
9 and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any
10 applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or
11 establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established
12 for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not
13 less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from
14 maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis,
15 piece-rate units earned.” (Lab. Code, § 1174, subd. (d), emphasis added.)

16 74. As explained in detail above, Defendants failed to provide the Class Members and the
17 Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements. Defendants did so, in part, because they
18 failed to accurately track hours worked by the Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees.
19 Defendants have thus failed to keep accurate records of the “total hours worked by the employee[s]”
20 in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), and are therefore subject to the penalties
21 provided by Labor Code section 226.3. These penalties are “in addition to any other penalty provided
22 by law.” (Lab. Code, § 226.3.)

23 75. The failure to accurately track hours worked also resulted in a failure of Defendants to
24 keep a record of all “payroll records showing the hours worked daily by” Defendants’ employees,
25 including Plaintiff and the other Class Members, in violation of Labor Code section 1174, subdivision
26 (d).

1 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

2 76. As mentioned above, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the Class
3 Members pursuant to section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

4 77. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all
5 members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the class is unknown to Plaintiff
6 at this time; however, it is estimated that the number of Class Members is greater than 100 individuals.
7 The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment
8 records.

9 78. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of**
10 **Interest:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated
11 non-exempt employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members
12 including, without limitation to:

13 A. Whether Defendants' pay policies/practices resulted in a failure to pay the Class
14 Members for all hours worked, including all minimum wages;

15 B. Whether Defendants' pay policies/practices resulted in a failure to pay the Class
16 Members for all required overtime wages at the Class Members' regular rate of pay;

17 C. Whether Defendants' rest period policies and practices afforded legally
18 compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

19 D. Whether Defendants' meal period policies and practices afforded legally
20 compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;

21 E. Whether Defendants maintained accurate employment records;

22 F. Whether Defendants timely paid all wages during employment;

23 G. Whether Defendants timely paid all wages earned and unpaid at separation;

24 H. Whether Defendants failed to pay separately and hourly for all rest and recovery
25 periods;

26 I. Whether Defendants failed to pay separately and hourly for all nonproductive
27 time;
28

1 J. Whether Defendants indemnified their employees for all necessary business
2 expenditures;

3 K. Whether Defendants furnished legally-compliant wage statements to the Class
4 Members pursuant to Labor Code sections 226 and 226.2; and

5 L. Whether Defendants' violations of the Labor Code and the Applicable Wage
6 Orders amounted to a violation of California's UCL.

7 79. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact
8 predominate over questions that affect only individual Class Members. The common questions of law
9 set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' uniform policies and practices
10 applicable to each individual class member, such as Defendants' uniform policy and practice of failing
11 to pay for all hours worked, Defendants' uniform policies and practices which failed to provide
12 compliant rest periods, Defendants' uniform policies and practices which failed to provide compliant
13 meal periods, Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and others. As such,
14 the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class
15 member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

16 80. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Class Members
17 because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the
18 statute(s) of limitation applicable to each cause of action pleaded in this complaint. As alleged herein,
19 Plaintiff, like the other Class Members, was deprived of minimum, regular, and overtime wages
20 because of Defendants' unlawful timekeeping policies and practices, was deprived of rest periods and
21 premium wages in lieu thereof, was deprived of meal periods and premium wages in lieu thereof, was
22 subject to Defendants' uniform rest period policies and practices, was subject to Defendants' uniform
23 meal period policies and practices, was not provided accurate itemized wage statements, was not paid
24 all wages in full and on time, , and was subject to other similar policies and practices to which the Class
25 Members were subject.

26 81. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to
27 represent fairly and adequately the interests of the Class Members. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are
28 ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the Class Members and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's

1 attorneys have prosecuted numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal court in the past
2 and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class Members.

3 82. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an
4 important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California.
5 These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers
6 who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior
7 economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of
8 this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and the Class Members make the class action
9 format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each
10 employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an
11 unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of
12 each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources.

13 83. Moreover, requiring each Class Member to pursue an individual remedy would also
14 discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action
15 against their former or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent
16 damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the
17 individual Class Members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying
18 verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual Class Members against Defendants herein, and
19 which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants or legal
20 determinations with respect to individual Class Members which would, as a practical matter, be
21 dispositive of the interest of the other Class Members not parties to adjudications or which would
22 substantially impair or impede the ability of the Class Members to protect their interests.

23 84. Further, the claims of the individual Class Members are not sufficiently large to warrant
24 vigorous individual prosecution considering the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As
25 such, the Class Members identified above are maintainable as a class under section 382 of the Code of
26 Civil Procedure.

1 **VI. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES**

2 85. Plaintiff has fully and completely exhausted administrative remedies under PAGA prior
3 to proceeding with the PAGA claims stated in this complaint. Plaintiff filed a PAGA notice online with
4 the Labor Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and sent a letter by certified mail to Defendants
5 setting forth the facts and theories of the violations alleged against Defendants, as prescribed by PAGA.
6 (Lab. Code, §§ 2698–2699.6.)

7 86. As required by PAGA, Plaintiff submitted the \$75.00 filing fee with the LWDA by
8 regular mail. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), no notice was received by
9 Plaintiff from the LWDA evidencing its intention to investigate within sixty-five calendar days of the
10 postmark date of the PAGA notice. And, for the allegations in this complaint alleging a violation for a
11 Labor Code section not listed in Labor Code section 2699.5, Defendant failed to avail themselves of
12 PAGA’s cure provisions within 33 calendar days of the postmark date of Plaintiff’s PAGA notice. (See
13 Lab. Code, § 2699.3, subd. (c)(2)(A).) Plaintiff is therefore entitled to commence and proceed with a
14 civil action pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.

15 **VII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

16 **First Cause of Action**

17 *Failure to Pay All Minimum Wages*

18 *(Against All Defendants)*

19 87. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

20 88. Section 4 of the Applicable Wage Orders and Labor Code section 1197 establish the
21 right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law. (Lab.
22 Code, § 1197; Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.) Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a),
23 and 1194.2, subdivision (a), provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage
24 as required by Labor Code section 1197 may recover the unpaid balance, together with attorneys’ fees
25 and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid wages and interest
26 accrued thereon.

27 89. Here, Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of the
28 law during the relevant statutory periods. Plaintiff and the other Class Members were not compensated

1 for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of
2 Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the Labor Code and the Applicable Wage
3 Orders.

4 90. Labor Code section 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under
5 conditions that the IWC Wage Orders prohibit. Labor Code sections 1194, subdivision (a), and 1194.2,
6 subdivision (a), provide that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage
7 is liable to pay those employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages
8 in an amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

9 91. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged herein,
10 Plaintiff and the other Class Members have sustained economic damages, including but not limited to
11 unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and they are entitled to recover
12 economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief because of Defendants'
13 violations of the Labor Code and Applicable Wage Orders.

14 92. Defendants' practices and policies regarding illegal employee compensation are
15 unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the other Class Members in a civil
16 action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages, liquidated damages, including interest thereon,
17 statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to Labor Code sections 204, 218.5, 1194,
18 1194.2, 1197, and 1198, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

19 **Second Cause of Action**

20 *Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages*

21 *(Against All Defendants)*

22 93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

23 94. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, and
24 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all overtime hours
25 worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for
26 overtime work performed. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly pay
27 Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all overtime wages earned pursuant to Labor Code section
28 1194 and the Applicable Wage Orders. Defendants caused Plaintiff and the other Class Members to

1 work overtime hours but did not compensate them at one and one-half times their regular rate of pay
2 for such hours in accordance with California law. Likewise, Defendants caused Plaintiff and the other
3 Class Members to work double-time hours but did not compensate them at twice their regular rate of
4 pay for such hours in accordance with California law.

5 95. Defendants failed to fully conform their pay practices to the requirements of California
6 law. This unlawful conduct includes but is not limited to Defendants' uniform and unlawful pay
7 policies and practices of failing to accurately record all the time that non-exempt employees were under
8 the supervision and control of Defendants. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and allow
9 Plaintiff and the other Class Members to recover in a civil action the unpaid amount of overtime
10 premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit
11 according to Labor Code section 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, the Applicable Wage Orders, and Code of
12 Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

13 **Third Cause of Action**

14 *Failure to Provide Rest Periods and Pay Missed Rest Period Premiums*

15 *(Against All Defendants)*

16 96. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

17 97. Section 12 of the Applicable Wage Orders, and Labor Code section 226.7 establish the
18 right of employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten minutes for each four hour period
19 worked, or major fraction thereof. (See Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160.)

20 98. Due to Defendants' unlawful rest period policies and practices described in detail above,
21 Defendants did not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the other Class Members to take all rest periods
22 to which they were legally entitled. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants have not paid an
23 additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and the other Class Members at their respective regular rates of pay
24 for each violation, in accordance with California Labor Code section 226.7.

25 99. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the other
26 Class Members in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest
27 thereon, statutory penalties, and costs of suit pursuant to the Applicable Wage Orders, and California
28 Labor Code section 226.7.

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

1 Plaintiff and the other Class Members have been denied their legal right and protected interest in having
2 available at a central location at the plant or establishment where they are employed, accurate and
3 complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, employees at those
4 respective locations pursuant to Labor Code 1174.

5 **Sixth Cause of Action**

6 *Failure to Pay Wages Timely during Employment*

7 *(Against All Defendants)*

8 107. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

9 108. Labor Code section 200 provides that “wages” include all amounts for labor performed
10 by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
11 task, pieces, commission basis, or other method of calculation. Labor Code section 204 states that all
12 wages earned by any person in any employment are payable twice during the calendar month and must
13 be paid not more than seven days following the close of the period when the wages were earned. Labor
14 Code section 210, subdivision (a), makes employers who violate Labor Code section 204 subject to a
15 penalty of \$100 for any initial failure to timely pay each employee’s full wages and \$200 for each
16 subsequent violation, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld.

17 109. Labor Code section 216 establishes that it is a misdemeanor for any person, with regards
18 to wages due, to “falsely deny the amount or validity thereof, or that the same is due, with intent to
19 secure himself, his employer or other person, any discount upon such indebtedness, or with intent to
20 annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud, the person to whom such indebtedness is due.”

21 110. Defendants as a matter of established company policy and procedure in the State of
22 California, scheduled, required, suffered, and/or permitted Plaintiff and the other Class Members, to
23 work without full compensation, to work without legally-compliant off-duty meal periods, to work
24 without legally-compliant off-duty rest periods, and thereby failed to fully pay Plaintiff and the other
25 Class Members within seven days of the close of payroll, as required by law.

26 111. Defendants, as a matter of established company policy and procedure in the State of
27 California, falsely deny they owe Plaintiff and the other Class Members these wages, with the intent of
28

1 securing for itself a discount upon its indebtedness and/or to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay,
2 and/or defraud Plaintiff and the other Class Members.

3 112. Defendants' pattern, practice, and uniform administration of its corporate policy of
4 illegally denying employees compensation, as described herein, is unlawful and entitles Plaintiff and
5 the other Class Members to recover, pursuant to Labor Code section 218, the unpaid balance of the
6 compensation owed to them in a civil action and any applicable penalties, attorney fees, and interest
7 owed to them pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 and 218.5.

8 **Seventh Cause of Action**

9 *Failure to Pay All Wages Earned and Unpaid at Separation*

10 *(Against All Defendants)*

11 113. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

12 114. The actionable period for this cause of action is three years prior to the filing of this
13 complaint through the present, and ongoing until the violations are corrected or the class is certified.
14 (*Pineda v. Bank of America, N.A.* (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1389, 1395; *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Productions,*
15 *Inc.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1094, 1109; Code Civ. Proc., § 338, subd. (a).) Labor Code sections 201 and
16 202 of the California Labor Code require Defendants to pay all compensation due and owing to its
17 former employees (including the formerly-employed Class Members) during the actionable period for
18 this cause of action at or around the time that their employment is or was terminated, or ended.

19 115. Section 203 of the Labor Code provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
20 compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required by Sections 201 and 202, then the
21 employer is liable for penalties in the form of continued compensation up to thirty workdays.

22 116. Due to Defendants' faulty pay policies, those Class Members whose employment with
23 Defendants has concluded were not compensated for each and every hour worked at the appropriate
24 rate. Defendants have willfully failed to pay those formerly-employed Class Members whose sums
25 were certain at the time of termination within seventy-two hours of their resignation and have failed to
26 pay those sums for thirty days thereafter as required by Labor Code sections 201 through 203.

27 117. As a result, Defendants are liable to the formerly-employed Class Members for waiting
28 time penalties amounting to thirty days wages for the formerly-employed Class Members pursuant to

1 Labor Code section 203. (See, e.g., DLSE Manual, § 4.3.4 [failure to pay any sort of wages due upon
2 termination entitles an employee to recover waiting time penalties].)

3 **Eighth Cause of Action**

4 *Failure to Indemnify All Necessary Business Expenditures*

5 *(Against All Defendants)*

6 118. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

7 119. California Labor Code Section 2802 states that employers must “indemnify” an
8 employee for “all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of
9 the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.” Likewise,
10 Labor Code section 2804 states that “any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any
11 employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall
12 not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled
13 under the laws of this State.”

14 120. Here, Plaintiff and the other Class Members paid out of pocket for necessary business
15 expenditures incurred as a direct consequence and requirement of performing their job duties, including
16 the costs associated with their personal cell phone and mileage they required to perform their work.
17 Despite knowing that Plaintiff and the other Class Members incurred these necessary business
18 expenses, and requiring Plaintiff and the other Class Members to use such items, Defendants did not
19 reimburse them.

20 121. Thus, Plaintiff and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the cost of such
21 necessary business expenses, plus interest from the date each incurred such business expenses, plus
22 fees and costs. (Lab. Code, § 2802, subds. (b), (c).)

23 **Ninth Cause of Action**

24 *Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements*

25 *(Against All Defendants)*

26 122. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

27 123. Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), obligates employers, semi-monthly or at the
28 time of each payment to furnish an itemized wage statement in writing showing:

- (1) The gross wages earned;
- (2) The total hours worked by the employee;
- (3) The number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece rate basis;
- (4) All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- (5) The net wages earned;
- (6) The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- (7) The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number;
- (8) The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
- (9) All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

124. Labor Code section 226.2 further obligates employers to include the following information on wage statements paid to employees who work on a piece-rate basis: the total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the total hours of other nonproductive time, the rates of compensation for those times, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the pay period. (Lab. Code, § 226.2, subd. (a)(2).)

125. As set forth above, Defendants issued and continues to issue wage statements to its non-exempt employees including Plaintiff and the other Class Members that are inadequate under Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), and Labor Code section 226.2, subdivision (a). By failing to pay Plaintiff and the other Class Members properly as described above, Defendants failed to include required information on their wage statements, including, but not limited to, the gross wages earned, total hours worked, the number of piece-rate units earned, the applicable piece rates during the pay period, the total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the total hours of nonproductive time, the rates of compensation for rest and recovery periods, the rates of compensation for nonproductive

1 time, the gross wages paid for rest and recovery periods, the gross wages paid for other nonproductive
2 time, the net wages earned, and the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
3 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate in violation of Labor Code sections 226,
4 subdivision (a), and 226.2, subdivision (a).

5 126. Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code sections 226, subdivision (a), of the
6 Labor Code was knowing and intentional. (Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (e).)

7 127. As a result of Defendants' issuance of inaccurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff
8 and the other Class Members in violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Plaintiff and the
9 other Class Members are each entitled to recover an initial penalty of \$50, and subsequent penalties of
10 \$100, up to an amount not exceeding an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per Plaintiff and per each Class
11 Member from Defendants pursuant to Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), along with costs and
12 reasonable attorneys' fees.

13 **Tenth Cause of Action**

14 *Failure to Pay Separately and Hourly in Violation of Labor Code Section 226.2*

15 *(Against All Defendants)*

16 128. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

17 129. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.2 required Defendants to pay
18 their employees who are compensated on a piece-rate basis during a pay period for rest and recovery
19 periods and other non-productive time separate from any piece-rate compensation. Pursuant to
20 California Labor Code section 226.2, subdivision (a)(3), employees who are compensated on a piece
21 rate basis shall be separately compensated for rest and recovery periods at a regular hourly rate that is
22 no less than the higher of: **(1)** the average hourly rate determined by dividing the total compensation
23 for the workweek, exclusive of any compensation for rest and recovery periods and any premium
24 compensation for overtime, by the total hours worked during the workweek, exclusive of rest and
25 recovery periods; or **(2)** the applicable minimum wages.

26 130. During the Class Period, Plaintiff and the Class Members paid on a piece-rate basis were
27 not compensated for rest and recovery periods (or not compensated at the regular rate of pay for those
28 rest and recovery periods) and other nonproductive time separate from any piece-rate pay.

131. At all relevant times, Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code section 226.2 by denying compensation for rest and recovery periods at the regular rate of pay.

132. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members compensated rest and recovery periods, and separate pay for nonproductive time, Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

133. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.2, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to recover their unpaid compensation.

Eleventh Cause of Action

Violations of California's Unfair Competition Law

(Against All Defendants)

134. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

135. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200 through 17210, by committing the unlawful acts described above. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and unlawful business practices deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiff and the other Class Members of compensation to which they are legally entitled. These practices constitute unfair and unlawful competition and provide an unfair advantage over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

136. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the Class Members, seeks full restitution of monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17208.

137. The acts complained of herein occurred within the four years prior to the initiation of this action and are continuing into the present and ongoing.

138. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this Court action to protect his interests and those of the Class Members, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf

1 of Defendants' current non-exempt employees and to enforce important rights affecting the public
2 interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiff
3 is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

4 **Twelfth Cause of Action**

5 *Penalties Pursuant to PAGA for Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201,*
6 *202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194,*
7 *1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2804, and Other Provisions of the*
8 *Labor Code*
9 *(Against All Defendants)*

10 139. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

11 140. Based on the above allegations incorporated by reference, Defendants violated Labor
12 Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194,
13 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2804, and others that may be applicable; and the
14 Applicable Wage Orders (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160), and others that may be
15 applicable.

16 141. As a result of the acts alleged above, Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code sections
17 2698 through 2699.6 because of Defendants' violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210,
18 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5,
19 1199, 2802, 2804, and others that may be applicable; and the Applicable Wage Orders (Cal. Code of
20 Regs., tit. 8, §§ 11040, 11160), and others that may be applicable. Each of these categories of violations
21 were knowing, intentional, and willful acts, and they were repeated, non-isolated, and recurring events
22 that extended beyond 30 days.

23 142. Under Labor Code sections 2699, subdivisions (a) and (f)(2), 2699.3, and 2699.5, for
24 each such violation, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to penalties in an amount to be
25 shown at the time of trial.

26 143. These penalties must be allocated sixty-five percent to the Labor and Workforce
27 Development Agency ("LWDA") and thirty-five percent to the affected employees. (Lab. Code, §
28 2699, subd. (m).)

1 144. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this action to protect his
2 interests and those of the Aggrieved Employees, and to assess and collect the wages and penalties owed
3 by Defendants. Plaintiff has thereby incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which Plaintiff is also entitled
4 to recover under Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (g)(1).

5 **VIII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

6 145. Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury of Plaintiff's and the Class Members' claims
7 against Defendants.

8 **IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought
10 against Defendants, as follows:

- 11 1. For an order certifying the proposed class;
- 12 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the class;
- 13 3. For an order appointing Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the class;
- 14 4. For the failure to pay all minimum wages, compensatory, consequential, general, and
15 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2,
16 1197, and others as may be applicable;
- 17 5. For the failure to pay all overtime wages, compensatory, consequential, general, and
18 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194,
19 1198, and others as may be applicable;
- 20 6. For the failure to provide rest periods and pay missed rest period premiums,
21 compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant
22 to Labor Code section 226.7;
- 23 7. For the failure to provide meal periods and pay missed meal period premiums,
24 compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant
25 to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512;
- 26 8. For the failure to maintain accurate employment records, penalties pursuant to Labor
27 Code sections 226.3, 1174.5, and others that may be applicable;
- 28

- 1 **9.** For the failure to pay wages timely during employment, the unpaid balance of the
2 compensation owed to Plaintiff and the other Class Members and any applicable
3 penalties owed to them pursuant to Labor Code section 210;
- 4 **10.** For the failure to pay all wages earned and unpaid at separation, statutory waiting time
5 penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 through 203, for the Class Members who
6 quit or were fired in an amount equal to their daily wage multiplied by thirty days, as
7 may be proven;
- 8 **11.** For the failure to indemnify all necessary business expenditures, all unreimbursed
9 business expenses, and interest thereon, that are owed, pursuant to Labor Code section
10 2802, and attorney fees, pursuant to Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (c);
- 11 **12.** For the failure to pay separately and hourly in violation of Labor Code section 226.2,
12 all compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof,
13 including all unpaid rest and recover periods and unproductive time at the appropriate
14 rate of pay;
- 15 **13.** For the violations of California's Unfair Competition Law, restitution to Plaintiff and
16 the other Class Members of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by
17 Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation
18 of Business and Professions Code sections 17200 through 17210;
- 19 **14.** For the claim of penalties pursuant to PAGA and other provisions of the California
20 Labor Code, a civil penalty in the amount of \$100 for the initial violation and \$200 for
21 each subsequent violation as specified in Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f)(2),
22 in the representative action brought on behalf of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
23 pursuant the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, and for civil penalties
24 available under Labor Code section 210;
- 25 **15.** Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6
26 and Civil Code sections 3287 and 3289;
- 27
28

- 1 **16.** On all causes of action for which attorneys’ fees may be available, for attorneys’ fees
2 and costs as provided by Labor Code sections 218.5, 226, Code of Civil Procedure
3 section 1021.5, and others as may be applicable;
- 4 **17.** For an order enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their agents, servants, and
5 employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from acting in
6 derogation of any rights or duties adumbrated in this complaint; and
- 7 **18.** For such other and further relief, this Court may deem just and proper.

8
9 Dated:

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.

10
11 _____
KYLE D. SMITH

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff, the Putative Class, and the
13 Aggrieved Employees
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28