

STANSBURY BROWN LAW, PC
DANIEL J. BROWN (SBN 307604)
dbrown@stansburybrownlaw.com
JESSICA FLORES (SBN 282669)
jflores@stansburybrownlaw.com
2610 ½ Abbot Kinney Blvd.
Venice, California 90291
Tel: (323) 204-3124

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

KATSUHIRA YUGUCHI, as an individual,
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AEROCHARTER LLC, a California limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24STCV25019

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

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

- (1) MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);**
- (2) FAILURE TO PAY ALL
OVERTIME WAGES (LABOR
CODE §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, AND
1198);**
- (3) MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7 AND 512)**
- (4) REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516);**
- (5) WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);**
- (6) WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE § 226, *et seq.*);**
- (7) UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE § 17200, *et seq.*);**
- (8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR
NECESSARY BUSINESS
EXPENSES (LABOR CODE § 2802);
AND**

(9) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT (LABOR CODE § 2698 *et seq.*).**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE**

1 Plaintiff Katsuhisa Yuguchi (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), as an individual, and on behalf of all
2 others similarly situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action
3 Complaint against Aerocharter LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1 to 100,
4 inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 1. Plaintiff hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action
7 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under California Business and Professions
8 Code § 17200 *et seq.*, Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 226 *et seq.*, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558,
9 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order
10 9 (“Wage Order 9”), in addition to seeking declaratory relief and restitution. This Complaint is
11 brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over
12 Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds
13 this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

14 **VENUE**

15 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil
16 Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts and omissions complained of herein
17 occurred in the County of Los Angeles. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have
18 an agent or agents within the County of Los Angeles, and/or otherwise are found within the
19 County of Los Angeles, and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of
20 service of process.

21 **PARTIES**

22 3. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein,
23 Plaintiff was and currently is a California resident. During the four years immediately preceding
24 the filing of the Complaint in this action and within the statute of limitations periods applicable
25 to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt
26 employee. Plaintiff was and is a victim of Defendants’ policies and/or practices complained of
27 herein, lost money and/or property, and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed by Labor Code
28 201-203, 204, 226 *et seq.*, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2698 *et*

1 *seq.*, California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* (“Unfair Competition Law”), and
2 Wage Order 9, which sets employment standards for the transportation industry.

3 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the four
4 years preceding the filing of the Complaint and continuing to the present, Defendants did (and
5 continue to do) business by providing aviation ground handling services in California and the
6 United States, employed Plaintiff within Los Angeles County and the state of California and,
7 therefore, were (and are) doing business in Los Angeles County and the State of California.

8 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner,
9 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said
10 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
11 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed,
12 and believe, and based thereon allege, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
13 partners, or corporate, were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
14 and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined herein) to be subjected to the
15 unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.

16 6. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
17 herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and all members of the Classes.

18 7. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing
19 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the
20 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of
21 the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned
22 were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each
23 of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or
24 omissions complained of herein.

25 8. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of
26 and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course
27 and scope of, and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further,
28 Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes towards Plaintiff and

1 all members of the Classes.

2 9. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
3 herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and all members of the Classes.
4 Plaintiff and the members of the Classes engage in interstate commerce activities in the course of
5 their job duties. As such, Plaintiff and the members of the Classes are “Transportation Workers”
6 exempt from arbitration within the definition of the Federal Arbitration Act. *See Southwest*
7 *Airlines Co. v Saxon*, 596 U.S. 450 (2022); *Carmona v. Domino’s Pizza, LLC*, 73 F.4th 1135 (9th
8 Cir. 2023); *Saige et al. v. U.S. District Court for the Central District of California*, No. 24-4072
9 (9th Cir. July 18, 2024).

10 **GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11 10. Plaintiff worked for Defendants between approximately September 6, 2022 and
12 January 2024 as a non-exempt detailer. Defendants are in the aviation industry and provide
13 ground handling services at LAX to national and international airlines such as the loading and
14 unloading of cargo that has or will travel through interstate commerce across state lines. Plaintiff’s
15 job responsibilities included maintaining equipment used for cargo handling such as tugs, cargo,
16 fuel tankers and luggage pulleys. Plaintiff also spent significant time escorting technicians and
17 other third parties who needed to access the premises for purposes such as repairing a machine
18 and who did not have the required clearance that Plaintiff had. Plaintiff was generally scheduled
19 to work 5 days per week from Monday to Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. or 5:00 p.m., but he
20 often worked longer.

21 11. Throughout the duration of Plaintiff’s employment with Defendants, Plaintiff and
22 other non-exempt employees were not paid for all hours worked as Defendants did not accurately
23 keep track of all hours worked. Upon information and belief, the time records maintained by
24 Defendants were not reflective of the actual number of hours that Plaintiff and other non-exempt
25 employees actually worked. Defendants required Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to
26 clock in and out through the ADP app on their personal cellular phones. However, upon
27 information and belief, Defendants shaved time off of Plaintiff’s time worked. Additionally,
28 Defendants required Plaintiff and other employees to perform work prior to clocking in and after

1 clocking out. Plaintiff estimates that at least twice per week for approximately 25 minutes each
2 time, he would perform work duties prior to clocking in such as purchasing supplies, picking up
3 towels from the dry cleaning service or preparing for a day of escorting third parties around the
4 premises. After clocking out, Plaintiff estimates that he spent another 25 minutes twice a week
5 performing work such as refilling supplies or organizing towels. Overall, Plaintiff and other non-
6 exempt employees were not compensated for at least approximately more than 2.5 hours of work
7 each week either due to working off the clock or due to Defendants shaving off their time worked.

8 12. Furthermore, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees worked overtime hours,
9 but did not receive all overtime compensation equal to one and one-half times their regular rates
10 of pay for all overtime hours worked. Defendants also maintained a policy/practice of not
11 compensating Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all their hours worked in the pay
12 period. As discussed above, upon information and belief, Defendants maintained a
13 policy/practice of shaving time worked off of the timecards of Plaintiff and other non-exempt
14 employees. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants systematically failed to pay
15 overtime compensation due to Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for the hours that they
16 worked off of the clock. As described above, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not
17 compensated for at least approximately more than 2.5 hours of overtime work each week. As a
18 result, Defendants failed to ensure that Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were being paid
19 at least the minimum wage for all hours worked, and failed to ensure that Plaintiff and other non-
20 exempt employees received proper overtime wages for all overtime hours worked.

21 13. Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized to take all legally
22 required rest periods. This practice was pervasive throughout Plaintiff's employment. Plaintiff
23 and other non-exempt employees almost never received a full, uninterrupted first or second rest
24 period because Defendants maintained a policy of requiring Plaintiff and other non-exempt
25 employees to work through their rest periods. Defendants did not communicate to Plaintiff and
26 other non-exempt employees that they were entitled to a 10-minute rest period. Each time that
27 Plaintiff requested a break or relief from escorting a third party on the premises, Defendants
28

1 denied his request. On the dates that Plaintiff worked more than 10 hours in one day, Plaintiff
2 almost never received a full, uninterrupted third rest period. Despite Defendants' failure to
3 authorize and permit Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to take all lawful paid rest periods,
4 due to their uniform and unlawful practices, Defendants almost never provided Plaintiff and other
5 non-exempt employees with an hour of pay at their regular rate for each rest period violation as
6 required by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, during at least a portion of the
7 class period, Defendants maintained no payroll code or another mechanism for the payment of
8 rest period premiums in the event Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not authorized
9 to take lawful rest periods.

10 14. At least three times per week, Defendants also did not provide Plaintiff and other
11 non-exempt employees with a legally compliant first meal period when they worked shifts in
12 excess of 5.0 hours. Defendants almost never provided Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees
13 with a legally compliant second meal period when they worked shifts longer than 10.0 hours.
14 Instead of providing Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with compliant meal periods,
15 Defendants required Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to work through their meal
16 periods. Upon information and belief, Defendants regularly adjusted the timecards of Plaintiff
17 and other non-exempt employees to reflect meal periods exactly 30 minutes in length even though
18 Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees did not receive such meal periods. Despite Defendants'
19 failure to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all lawful meal periods due to
20 their uniform and unlawful practices, Defendants almost never provided Plaintiff and other non-
21 exempt employees with an hour of pay at their regular rate for each meal period violation as
22 required by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, during at least a portion of the
23 class period, Defendants maintained no payroll code or another mechanism for the payment of
24 meal period premiums in the event that Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not
25 authorized to take meal periods.

26 15. Furthermore, Defendants failed to adequately reimburse Plaintiff and other non-
27 exempt employees for all reasonable and necessary work expenditures, including, but not limited
28

1 to, requiring Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees to utilize their personal cell phones for
2 necessary business purposes such as clocking in and out.

3 16. Defendants have maintained inaccurate payroll records, failed to timely pay all
4 wages owed to employees, and failed to timely pay separating employees at the time of their
5 separation, and issued inaccurate wage statements. This is in part a result of Defendants' failure
6 to accurately compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all minimum and
7 overtime wages, and failure to pay premium pay for failing to provide all required meal periods
8 and authorize all rest periods.

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

19 18. Finally, Defendants failed to conform to the requirements of Labor Code § 2810.5
20 by failing to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees written notices, in the language
21 normally used to communicate employment related information to the employees, containing
22 information regarding their: i) rate(s) of pay and the basis thereof; ii) allowances claimed as part
23 of the minimum wage; iii) regular payday designated by the employer; iv) the legal name of the
24 employer; v) the address of the legal entity that is the employer; vi) the telephone number of the
25 employer; vii) identifying information for the employer's workers' compensation insurance
26 carrier; and viii) information informing the employee of their right to accrue and use paid sick
27 leave. Despite maintaining an obligation to provide these disclosures to Plaintiff and other
28 aggrieved employees, Defendants failed to do so, in violation of Labor Code § 2810.5.

1 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

2 19. **Class Definitions:** Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and the
3 following Classes pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

- 4 a. The Minimum Wage Class consists of all current and former non-exempt
5 employees of Defendants in California who were subject to Defendants'
6 timekeeping systems and/or practices, during the four years immediately
7 preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.
- 8 b. The Overtime Wage Class consists of all current and former non-exempt
9 employees of Defendants in California who worked overtime hours and were
10 subject to Defendants' timekeeping systems and/or practices, during the four years
11 immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present
- 12 c. The Rest Period Class consists of all current and former non-exempt employees of
13 Defendants in California who worked at least one shift in excess of 3.5 hours
14 during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the
15 present.
- 16 d. The Meal Period Class consists of all current and former non-exempt employees
17 of Defendants who performed work in California and: (i) worked at least one shift
18 in excess of 5.0 hours without a meal period of at least 30 minutes in duration
19 commencing prior to the conclusion of the fifth hour of work, and who do not have
20 a corresponding meal period premium payment made for such shifts and/or (ii)
21 worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0 hours while performing work for
22 Defendants in California without a second meal period of at least 30 minutes in
23 duration commencing prior to the conclusion of the tenth hour of work, and who
24 do not have a corresponding meal period premium payment made for such shifts
25 during the four years preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.
- 26 e. The Employee Expense Class consists of all of current and former non-exempt
27 employees of Defendants in California who were not reimbursed for expenses in
28

the performance of their job duties, including, but not limited to the utilization of their personal cell phones for necessary business purposes such as clocking in and out during the four years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit to the present.

f. The Wage Statement Class consists of all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in California who received a wage statement from Defendants during the one year immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.

g. The Waiting Time Class consists of all of Defendants' formerly employed non-exempt employees in California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping systems and/or practices, during the three years immediately preceding the filing of this lawsuit through the present.

20. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, it is estimated that the members of the Classes number greater than fifty (50) individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records.

21. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of Interest:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members. Those common questions include, without limitation:

- i. Whether Defendants paid all minimum wages owed for all hours worked to members of the Minimum Wage Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 118.2, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;
- ii. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions, including, but not limited to, §§ 510 and 1194 and Wage Order 9 by requiring members of the Overtime Wage Class to perform overtime work and not paying for said work in

accordance with the overtime laws of the State of California;

- iii. Whether Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices resulted in the failure to properly compensate members of the Minimum Wage Class;
- iv. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant meal periods to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- v. Whether Defendants provided all legally compliant rest periods to members of the Rest Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
- vi. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse members of the Employee Expense Class for business expenditures necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties;
- vii. Whether Defendants provided accurate, itemized wage statements to members of the Classes; and
- viii. Whether Defendants' policies and/or practices for the timing and amount of payment of final wages to members of the Waiting Time Class at the time of separation from employment were lawful.

22. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common questions of law set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants' policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member, such as Defendants' uniform timekeeping policies and practices, meal and rest period policies and practices, wage statement policies and practices, and the policies and practices regarding the timely payment of final wages. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

23. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statute(s) of limitations period applicable to each cause of action pled in the Complaint. As alleged herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was subject to Defendants' meal/rest period and

timekeeping policies and practices, was provided inaccurate wage statements, and was not paid all wages earned at the time of his separation of employment.

24. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have prosecuted and defended numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

25. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Moreover, requiring each member of the Classes to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be

dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the individual members of the Classes are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As such, the Classes (as defined herein) are maintainable as a Class under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

26. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

27. Wage Order 9, § 4 and California Labor Code §§ 1197 and 1182.12 establish the right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked in amounts set by state law. Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid wages and interest accrued thereon. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and the Minimum Wage Class for all hours actually worked including, but not limited to, all hours he was subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and Wage Order 9.

28. California Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees the balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

29. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff and the Minimum Wage Class have sustained economic damages, including but not limited to, unpaid wages and lost interest in an amount to be established at trial, and are

1 entitled to recover economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief as
2 a result of Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 9.

3 30. Defendants' practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding
4 illegal employee compensation is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and
5 the Minimum Wage Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages, liquidated
6 damages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and attorneys' fees and costs of suit
7 according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 558, 1194, *et seq.*, 1197, 1198 and Code of Civil
8 Procedure § 1021.5.

9 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES**

11 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

12 31. Plaintiff re-allege and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

13 32. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194,
14 and 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to overtime wages for all
15 overtime hours worked, and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime
16 compensation for overtime work performed.

17 33. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate
18 Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class for all overtime hours worked pursuant to California
19 Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 9. Wage Order 9, § 3 requires an employer to pay overtime
20 wages when an employee's hours worked cross certain thresholds or meet certain criteria set forth
21 in the Wage Order.

22 34. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create entitlement to
23 recovery by Plaintiff and the Overtime Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of overtime
24 premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and attorneys' fees and costs of
25 suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198, Wage Order 9, and
26 Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

27 ///

28 ///

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

35. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

36. Plaintiff is informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California, including Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all legally compliant meal periods in accordance with the mandates of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 9, § 11. Despite Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rate of pay, in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 226.7, and 512.

37. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal period violations including interest thereon, as well as statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 226.7, 512, Wage Order 9, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

38. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

39. Wage Order 9, § 12 and California Labor Code §§ 226.2, 226.7 and 516 establish the right of employees to be authorized and permitted to take a paid rest period of at least ten (10) minutes net rest time for each four (4) hour period worked, or major fraction thereof.

40. As alleged herein, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class to take all legally compliant rest periods.

41. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class in a civil action for the unpaid rest period wages and the amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest thereon, as well as statutory penalties, civil

penalties, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

42. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

43. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of termination of employment in the event the employer discharges the employee or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of his/her intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of his/her intent to quit, said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last date of employment.

44. Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages due to them at the time of their separation including, among other things, unpaid and/or underpaid overtime and minimum wages owed, and rest period premium wages. Further, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that as a matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay members of the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-203. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

45. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in a continued payment of wages up to thirty (30) days from the time the wages were due. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Class are entitled to compensation pursuant to Labor Code § 203, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

///

///

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

46. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

47. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Class with complete and accurate wage statements reflecting the meal & rest period premiums in violation of Labor Code § 226 et seq.

48. Defendants' failures in furnishing Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Class with complete and accurate itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led to, among other things, the non-payment of all minimum and overtime wages, meal and rest period premium wages, and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies in Defendants' reported data.

49. Defendants' failures create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Class in a civil action for all damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226 et seq., including statutory penalties, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226 et seq.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
UNFAIR COMPETITION
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

50. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

51. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq., by failing to pay Plaintiff and the Classes all minimum and overtime wages, failing to provide all required meal and rest periods, or pay premium payments in lieu thereof, failing to furnish accurate, itemized wage statements, and willfully failing to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time class all final wages due upon separation of employment.

52. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides 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.

53. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff for herself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seek 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 §§ 17203 and 17208.

54. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action.

55. Plaintiff is compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf of Defendants' current non-exempt employees, and to enforce important rights affecting the public interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

56. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

57. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2802, which states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employees 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..."

58. Due to Defendants' unlawful policy and practice of requiring employees to use their personal cell phones in the performance of their work duties, Defendants have violated Labor Code § 2802.

59. Plaintiff and the members of the Employee Expense Class are entitled to attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(c) for bringing this action.

60. Pursuant to Labor Code §2802(b), any action brought for the reimbursement of necessary expenditures carries interest at the same rate as judgments in civil actions. Thus, Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class are entitled to interest, which shall accrue from the date on which they incurred the initial necessary expenditure.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

61. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

62. Defendants have committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff, members of the Classes, and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff, an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, acting on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees, brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff, the members of the Classes, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (5) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code violations:

- a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Plaintiff, the Minimum Wage Class, and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 551-552, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- b. Failing to pay Plaintiff, the Overtime Class, and other aggrieved employees all earned overtime compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- c. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay rest period premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Rest Period Class, and other aggrieved employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516 and 558;
- d. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Meal Period Class, and other aggrieved employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198;
- e. Failing to reimburse Plaintiff, the Employee Expense Class and other aggrieved employees for necessary business expenditures incurred by Plaintiff, and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 2800, 2802 and 2804;
- f. Failing to furnish Plaintiff, the Wage Statement Class, and other aggrieved employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;
- g. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Plaintiff, the Waiting Time Class, and other aggrieved employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203;
- h. Failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204;
- i. Failing to permit and authorize Plaintiff and other non-exempt to exercise the use of their accrued paid sick leave days in violation of Labor Code § 245.5, 246 and 248.5;

1 j. Failing to provide legally mandated disclosures and/or written notices
2 regarding the terms of employment of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees
3 in violation of Labor Code § 2810.5; and

4 k. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Plaintiff and other aggrieved
5 employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

6 63. On September 26, 2024, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and
7 notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of
8 Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for
9 civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2698 et seq. with respect to violations of the
10 California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 62 (a)-(k). Now that sixty-five days have passed
11 from Plaintiff’s notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, and the LWDA has not
12 provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted his
13 administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with
14 respect to these violations.

15 64. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to
16 protect her interests and the interests of other similarly aggrieved employees, and to assess and
17 collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff has thereby incurred attorneys’ fees and
18 costs, which she is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

19
20 **PRAYER**

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for herself and for all others on whose behalf
22 this suit brought against Defendants, as follows:

- 23 1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
24 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
25 3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
26 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated
27 damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2,
28 1198 and Wage Order 9 § 4(A);

1 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and
2 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, 1198 and
3 Wage Order 9 § 3(A);

4 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and
5 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;

6 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and
7 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;

8 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory waiting time penalties pursuant to
9 Labor Code §§ 201-203;

10 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
11 226;

12 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff of all money and/or
13 property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this
14 Court to be in violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*;

15 11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and
16 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;

17 12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each
18 failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional
19 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the
20 amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent
21 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial
22 violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per
23 employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent
24 violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (5) \$100.00 for
25 each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for the
26 violations of the Labor Code Sections cited in Labor Code § 2699.5;

27 13. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to California Labor
28 Code § 218.6 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

1 14. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code
2 §226, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

3 15. For such other and further relief the Court may deem just and proper.

4
5 Dated: December 10, 2024

Respectfully submitted,
STANSBURY BROWN LAW, PC

6
7
8 By: _____

Jess Flores
Daniel J. Brown
Jessica Flores
Attorneys for Plaintiff

9
10
11
12 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

13 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable by jury.

14
15 Dated: December 10, 2024

Respectfully submitted,
STANSBURY BROWN LAW, PC

16
17
18 By: _____

Jess Flores
Daniel J. Brown
Jessica Flores
Attorneys for Plaintiff

1
2 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

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

5 I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of
6 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 2610 ½ Abbot Kinney
Blvd. Venice, CA 90291

7 On December 10, 2024, I served the document listed below on the parties in this action as
8 follows:

9 - **FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
10 COMPLAINT**

11 ☒ (BY MAIL) I placed such envelope on the above date, with postage fully prepaid, for
12 deposit in the U.S. Postal Service at my place of business at Venice, California,
13 following the ordinary business practices of my place of business. I am readily familiar
14 with the business practice at my place of business for collection and processing of
15 correspondence for mail with the U.S. Postal Service. Under that practice, such
correspondence is deposited with the U.S. Postal Service the same day it is collected
and processed in the ordinary course of business.

16 ☐ (BY EMAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION) By electronically transmitting the
17 document(s) listed above to the email address(es) of the person(s) set forth on the
18 attached service list from the email address assistant@stansburybrownlaw.com. I did
19 not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or
20 other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful. Service by e-mail was made
pursuant to agreement of the parties, confirmed in writing, or as an additional method
of service as a courtesy to the parties or pursuant to Court Order. See Cal. R. Ct. R.
2.260.

21 ☒ (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
22 that the above is true and correct.

23 Executed on December 10, 2024, at South Gate, CA.

24 *Laura Romero*

25 _____
26 Laura Romero
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SERVICE LIST

I. Aerocharter, LLC
Attn: Darren Schwartz
6565 Crescent Park West 306
Los Angeles, CA. 90094

II. Aerocharter, LLC
5600 W. Century Blvd. #229
Los Angeles, CA. 90045

Agent for Service of Process for Aerocharter, LLC