

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
Allen Feghali (SBN 301080)
Jacquelyne VanEmmerik (SBN 339338)
MOON LAW GROUP, P.C.
725 South Figueroa Street, 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125
Email: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
Email: afeghali@moonlawgroup.com
Email: jvanemmerik@moonlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
Rene Perez and Jose D. Nunez Cardenas

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

RENE PEREZ, individually, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

NORTH BAY JACK, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24CV089168

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

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226];
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*]; and
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT..... 1

THE PARTIES.....3

 A. Plaintiffs.....3

 B. Defendants3

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION.....4

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS.....8

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION12

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION.....13

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION.....14

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....15

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....16

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION16

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION18

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....19

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION22

PRAYER FOR RELIEF24

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL28

1 Plaintiffs Rene Perez and Jose D. Nunez Cardenas (“Plaintiffs”), based upon facts that either
2 have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for
3 further investigation and discovery, allege as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendants North Bay Jack, Inc. and DOES 1
6 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code and Business and
7 Professions Code violations stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to
8 pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods,
9 failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages
10 to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish
11 accurate wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiffs bring the First through Eighth Causes of Action as individuals, on behalf of
13 themselves, and as a class action, on behalf of all other persons who have been employed by any
14 Defendant in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations
15 period applicable to the claims pleaded here (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or
16 “Class Members” and defined more fully below).

17 3. Plaintiffs bring the Ninth Cause of Action as individuals, on behalf of themselves, and
18 as representatives, on behalf of the State of California and all other persons who have been employed
19 by any Defendant in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the applicable statute
20 of limitations period (collectively referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”) pursuant to the
21 California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), to recover civil penalties that are owed to
22 Plaintiffs, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees.

23 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and establishment
24 within the State of California, including Alameda County. As such, and based upon all the facts and
25 circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are subject to the California
26 Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders, and the California Business and
27 Professions Code.

1 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a
2 systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 3 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum and
4 overtime wages, in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC
5 Wage Orders;
- 6 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods, maintain
7 accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and pay an additional
8 hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation occurred, in compliance
9 with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- 10 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
11 periods and pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest period
12 violation occurred, in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC
13 Wage Orders;
- 14 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred, in
15 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- 16 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal
17 period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the time
18 period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- 19 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked, in
20 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders; and
- 21 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
22 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC
23 Wage Orders.

24 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
25 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
26 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were
27 willful and deliberate.
28

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

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

8. Plaintiff Rene Perez is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Alameda, State of California, as a Store Manager from approximately August 2007 to April 2024. Plaintiff Jose D. Nunez Cardenas is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Mendocino, State of California, as a Store Manager from approximately November 2020 to February 2024.

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

B. Defendants

10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief allege, that Defendants are and, at all times mentioned herein, were:

- (a) Business entities with their principal places of business in Alameda, California;
- (b) Business entities conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Alameda County;
- (c) The former employers of Plaintiffs;
- (d) The current and/or former employers of the putative Class and Aggrieved Employees, who suffered and permitted Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions; and
- (e) The joint employers of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

1 11. Plaintiffs do not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities
2 sued herein as DOES 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names.
3 Each DOE Defendant was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiffs,
4 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to set
5 forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together
6 with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

7 12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as DOES 1-10, inclusive, and
8 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
9 injured a significant number of the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of
10 California.

11 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that, at all relevant times, each
12 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiffs and the
13 other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages,
14 hours, and working conditions.

15 14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that, at all relevant times, each
16 Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder,
17 subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or
18 all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint
19 enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to
20 be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below.

21 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that, at all relevant times, each
22 Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each
23 Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled,
24 aided, and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

25 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

26 16. Plaintiffs are California residents who worked for Defendants in the County of
27 Alameda, State of California, and in the County of Mendocino, State of California, respectively,
28 during the statutory period. During the statutory time period, Defendants classified Plaintiffs as a

1 non-exempt employees. Plaintiffs were typically scheduled to work at least five (5) days in a
2 workweek, and typically in excess of eight (8) hours in a single workday.

3 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs for all hours
4 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiffs with
5 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take uninterrupted rest periods,
6 failed to indemnify Plaintiffs for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all final wages to
7 Plaintiffs when Defendants terminated Plaintiffs' employment, and failed to furnish accurate wage
8 statements to Plaintiffs. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience working for Defendants was
9 typical and illustrative.

10 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
11 paying Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all
12 overtime wages. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
13 were required to work off-the-clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
14 Aggrieved Employees were required to wait in line in order to clock into work and when returning
15 from meal breaks, primarily because employees clocked in through cash registers and those were
16 often being used to assist customers, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiffs, the Class, and
17 the Aggrieved Employees were often interrupted during meal breaks without compensation. Also,
18 throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees received
19 nondiscretionary bonuses and other remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all
20 remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, meal break premium rate of pay, and
21 sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment.

22 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
23 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants
24 sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to work in
25 excess of five (5) consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute, continuous and
26 uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five (5) hours of work, or without compensating
27 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the
28 end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform

1 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of
2 the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than ten (10) hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work.
3 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs, the Class,
4 and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

5 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize and
6 permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods.
7 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
8 to work in excess of four (4) consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting
9 them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four (4) hours of work
10 (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
11 Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did not adequately
12 inform Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period.
13 Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest
14 periods for Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate
15 policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate
16 policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were taking
17 their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work
18 periods, and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
19 Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants'
20 policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
21 Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

22 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiffs, the Class,
23 and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties
24 for Defendants without reimbursement, such as requiring Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
25 Employees to purchase certain types of shoes, maintenance of uniforms, and were required to use
26 their own personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Also, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
27 Aggrieved Employees were required to use their own personal vehicles on occasion to run errands
28 such as bank runs and to pick up items.

1 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely pay
2 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all wages
3 for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium
4 wages. Further, Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees their
5 final paychecks immediately upon termination.

6 23. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiffs, the Class, and
7 the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly
8 rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for
9 hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided
10 in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and
11 permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address). Further, the wage
12 statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As a result of these
13 violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees
14 suffered injury because, among other things:

- 15 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
16 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
17 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
18 entitled;
- 19 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
20 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though
21 they had not been;
- 22 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
23 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
24 California rate, even though they were;
- 25 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
26 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California
27 rate, even though they had not been;

- 1 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
2 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
3 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
4 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to
5 perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed
6 to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements
7 contained the required accurate information;
8 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
9 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability,
10 unemployment, and other governmental benefits; and
11 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
12 rates to which Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were
13 entitled, and Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less
14 than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

15 Thus, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for
16 in California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

17 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18 24. Plaintiffs bring certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other
19 persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure
20 § 382.

21 25. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiffs seek relief
22 authorized by California law.

23 26. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

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

26 27. At all material times, Plaintiffs were members of the Class.

27 28. Plaintiffs undertake this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
28 conditions of all Class Members.

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

- 3 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
4 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
5 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time,
6 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the
7 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
8 Defendants' records.
- 9 (b) Typicality: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
10 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined
11 community of interest, and Plaintiffs' claims (or defenses, if any) are typical
12 of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.
- 13 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
14 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined
15 community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein.
16 Plaintiffs have no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member.
17 Plaintiffs' attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules
18 governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiffs have
19 incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur
20 costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended
21 for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class
22 member.
- 23 (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair
24 and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:
- 25 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling
26 the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 27 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy
28 already commenced by or against members of the Class;

1 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the
2 claims in the particular forum; and

3 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class
4 action.

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

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

17 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum wages,
18 and overtime wages;

19 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class
20 Members;

21 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages
22 to Class Members;

23 (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge
24 or resignation;

25 (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and
26 all meal periods Class Members took or missed;

27 (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; and
28

1 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result
2 of their illegal conduct as described above.

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

- 5 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
6 question affecting only individual members;
- 7 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
8 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 9 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
10 members of the class before the Court;
- 11 (d) Plaintiffs, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
12 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class
13 action;
- 14 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
15 relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for
16 the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount
17 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries
18 sustained;
- 19 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual
20 members of the class would create a risk of:
- 21 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
22 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of
23 conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 24 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as
25 a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not
26 parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede
27 their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited to the
28 potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are,

or may be, responsible Defendants; and,

(g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the class as a whole.

32. Plaintiffs contemplate the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiffs would contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

33. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this Complaint.

34. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

35. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiffs and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

36. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover minimum wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

37. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiffs and the Class have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

38. By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiffs and the Class for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiffs and the Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiffs and the Class, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

41. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Plaintiffs and the Class were entitled to be paid twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiffs and the Class all such wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

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

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

43. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this Complaint.

44. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

45. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday unless they receive additional

1 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
2 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by
3 the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

4 46. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiffs and the Class have worked more than eight (8)
5 hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

6 47. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Class overtime
7 compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as
8 required by California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198. Plaintiffs and the Class are regularly required
9 to work overtime hours.

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

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

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

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

27 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

28 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

52. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this Complaint.

53. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiffs and the Class of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of Plaintiffs and the Class' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

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

55. Under California law, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to be paid one (1) hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

56. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this Complaint.

57. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten (10) uninterrupted minutes for each four (4) hours of work or major fraction of four (4) hours (i.e. more than two hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten (10) minutes each for each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six (6) hours and ten

(10) minutes, the employee is entitled to two (2) rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage Order.

58. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiffs and the Class to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked more than four (4) hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs and the Class to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

59. Under California law, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to be paid one (1) hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided with all required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)

60. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this Complaint.

61. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by failing to pay and indemnify the Plaintiffs and the Class for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants.

62. As a result, Plaintiffs and the Class were damaged at least in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their wages.

63. Plaintiffs and the Class they represent are entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(b).

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time Penalties)

1 64. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1
2 through 23 in this Complaint.

3 65. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an
4 employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and
5 payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her
6 wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the
7 employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which
8 case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

9 66. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiffs and many
10 other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment
11 of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail to
12 pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California Labor
13 Code §§ 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving
14 Defendants' employ.

15 67. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and those Class members who are no longer
16 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
17 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201
18 and 202.

19 68. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages
20 owed, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty
21 wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the
22 wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

23 69. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally
24 accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30)
25 days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

26 70. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194, Plaintiffs and the Class
27 are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in
28 this action.

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

4 71. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1
5 through 23 in this Complaint.

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

17 73. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
18 complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to
19 correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiffs and the Class, the failure to list the true “total
20 hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

21 74. As a result of Defendants’ violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiffs and
22 the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

23 75. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have been injured by
24 Defendants’ intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both
25 their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage
26 statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

27 76. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiffs and the Class is difficult and
28 time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiffs and the Class were also injured as a

1 result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following
2 Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related
3 laws and regulations.

4 77. Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages
5 caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

6 78. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of
7 attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code §
8 226(h).

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

12 79. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1
13 through 23 in this Complaint.

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

16 81. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
17 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiffs seek to
18 enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure §
19 1021.5.

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

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

1 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

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

5 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

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

9 **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked**

10 86. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance
11 with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or unfair
12 activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

13 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

14 87. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor Code
15 §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair
16 activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

17 **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

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

21 **Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses**

22 89. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in
23 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
24 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
25 *seq.*

26 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

27 90. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance with
28 California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited

1 by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

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

6 92. Plaintiffs and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of
7 Defendants' wrongful conduct.

8 93. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, are entitled to,
9 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
10 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiffs and the Class have been deprived, by
11 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiffs and
12 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of Defendants
13 in order to recover restitution.

14 94. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further
15 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair, unlawful
16 and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them, from engaging
17 in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the future.

18 95. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no plain,
19 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members suffered as a
20 consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of
21 the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiffs, individually, and
22 on behalf of members of the putative Class, have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
23 harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
24 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

25 96. Plaintiffs also allege that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
26 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
27 withholdings.

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

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004,
Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*)

98. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 23 in this Complaint.

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

100. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current or former employees against whom a violation of the same provision was committed pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

101. Plaintiffs exhausted their administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. On August 29, 2024, and August 31, 2024, respectively, Plaintiffs Rene Perez and Jose D. Nunez Cardenas gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants violated against Plaintiffs and certain current and former Aggrieved Employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiffs also paid their respective filing

1 fees. Plaintiff Rene Perez's PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1047358-24, and Plaintiff Jose D.
2 Nunez Cardenas's PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1048503-24.

3 102. More than sixty-five (65) days have elapsed since Plaintiffs provided notice, but the
4 Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate
5 Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiffs may commence a
6 civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699, pursuant to § 2699.3, for the violations of
7 the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties
8 under California Labor Code §§ 1194, 2802, 226, and 2699(f)(2).

9 103. In addition, Plaintiffs seek penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor
10 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
11 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California
12 Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order §
13 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each
14 work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded. Additionally,
15 pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total hours worked in the
16 payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

17 104. During the time period of employment for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees,
18 Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to
19 maintain accurate records showing meal periods. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records
20 required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the
21 ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods. Therefore,
22 Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all
23 of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiffs
24 and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the
25 use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in
26 seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective
27 damage in amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply
28 with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have

1 also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the
2 wage payments paid to them.

3 105. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award
4 of civil penalties on behalf of themselves, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved Employees
5 of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown
6 according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law. In
7 addition, Plaintiffs seek an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Labor
8 Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an
9 award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

13 **Class Certification**

- 14 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third,
15 Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;
16 2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as representatives of the Class; and
17 3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel.

18 **As to the First Cause of Action**

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

- 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

11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate;
12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a); and,
14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

15. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
16. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate;
17. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;
21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;
22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and for costs of suit incurred herein; and
24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

1 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

2 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
3 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

4 26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
5 appropriate;

6 27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
7 such amounts were due;

8 28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

10 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

11 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
12 Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of
13 termination of the employment;

14 31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former
15 employees who have left Defendants' employ;

16 32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

17 33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

19 As to the Seventh Cause of Action

20 35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record
21 keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and
22 willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

23 36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

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

26 38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

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

28 //

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

46. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay all wages owed, including overtime, failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest breaks, failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements;

47. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*, and all other applicable Labor Code provisions;

48. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*; and,

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

As to all Causes of Action

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

Dated: November 5, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

MOON LAW GROUP, P.C.

By: /s/ Kane Moon

Kane Moon, Esq.

Allen Feghali, Esq.

Jacquelyne VanEmmerik, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,

Rene Perez and Jose D. Nunez Cardenas

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

Dated: November 5, 2024

MOON LAW GROUP, P.C.

By: /s/ Kane Moon

Kane Moon, Esq.

Allen Feghali, Esq.

Jacquelyne VanEmmerik, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,

Rene Perez and Jose D. Nunez Cardenas

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3) ss
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

5 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18
6 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 725 S Figueroa St., 31st Floor, Los
7 Angeles, California 90017. On **November 5, 2024**, I served the foregoing document described
8 as:

9 **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

10 X by placing ___ the original X a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelope(s)
11 addressed as follows:

12 **Anil Yadav, Authorized Agent for Service of Process**
13 **3550 Mowry Avenue, Suite 301**
14 **Fremont, CA 94538**

15 *Agent for Service for Defendant NORTH BAY JACK, INC., a California corporation*

16 [✓] **BY U.S. MAIL:** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The
17 envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am “readily familiar” with the
18 firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that
19 practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage
20 thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am
21 aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal
22 cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for
23 mailing in affidavit.

24 X (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
25 that the above is true and correct.

26 Executed on **November 5, 2024**, at Los Angeles, California.

27 Steven Delgado
28 Name

/s/ Steven Delgado
Signature