

Manny Starr (319778)
manny@frontierlawcenter.com
Daniel Ginzburg (327338)
dan@frontierlawcenter.com

Assigned for All Purposes
Judge Randall J. Sherman

FRONTIER LAW CENTER
23901 Calabasas Road, Suite 1084
Calabasas, CA 91302
Telephone: (818) 914-3433
Facsimile: (818) 914-3433

CX-105

Attorneys for Plaintiff ALFONSO LOPEZ,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

ALFONSO LOPEZ, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Case No. 30-2024-01446923-CU-OE-CXC

Plaintiff(s),

COMPLAINT

v.

LEGENDS HOSPITALITY, LLC; and DOES 1
through 100,

Defendant(s).

- 1. Meal Break Violation**
- 2. Rest Break Violation**
- 3. Failure to Pay All Hours Worked**
- 4. Wage Statement Violation**
- 5. Waiting Time Penalties**
- 6. Unfair Competition**
- 7. PAGA Allegations**
- 8. Retaliation in Violation of Lab.C. § 1102.5**
- 9. Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy**

RELEVANT PARTIES

1. Plaintiff ALFONSO LOPEZ ("Plaintiff") is an adult resident of San Bernardino County, and was at all times relevant residing in San Bernardino County.
2. Defendant LEGENDS HOSPITALITY, LLC ("Defendant") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business located in New York, New York.
3. Defendant is registered to and does conduct business in the State of California and is subject to the laws of the State of California. All acts and omissions of Defendant employees as alleged herein occurred while they were acting within the course and scope of their employment.

1 4. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1
2 through 100, inclusive (“Doe Defendants”), and therefore sues said Doe Defendants by such
3 fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of this Court to amend this Complaint to insert the true
4 names and capacities of such Doe Defendants when such information has been obtained. Plaintiff is
5 informed and believes, and based on such information and belief alleges, that each of the fictitiously
6 named Doe Defendants has participated in some way in the wrongful acts and omissions alleged
7 below, and is liable to Plaintiff for damages and other relief to which Plaintiff is entitled. Defendant
8 and Doe Defendants are collectively referred to as “Defendants”.

9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 5. This action is properly filed in Orange County because the acts and omissions that give rise
11 to Plaintiff’s claims took place in Orange County, and Defendants transact substantial business in
12 this County.

13 6. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants’ unlawful conduct as
14 alleged herein occurred in Orange County, California and Plaintiff suffered damages from such
15 conduct within Orange County, California.

16 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

17 7. At all times relevant, Plaintiff was Defendants’ employee.

18 8. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from 2020 to June 17, 2024.

19 9. Around May 2024, Plaintiff became aware of underpayment of his wages.

20 10. Plaintiff, together with other members of Plaintiff’s union, organized a collective break-
21 taking action.

22 11. Further, Plaintiff and other co-workers reported to HR Representative Haley concerns
23 regarding unpaid wages and tip transparency.

24 12. Around June 2024, Plaintiff made a verbal complaint to HR Representative Ron about meal
25 and rest break violations. Plaintiff also made a verbal complaint to Giovanni, information input
26 manager, of the same meal and rest break violations.

27 13. In retaliation to Plaintiff’s complaints and reports, Defendants terminated Plaintiff from
28 employment on June 17, 2024.

1 14. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with compliant meal breaks because Plaintiff was
2 required to clock out for a 30-minute meal break immediately after clocking in for his shift. No
3 other meal breaks were provided despite working shifts longer than 5 hours. Despite not being
4 provided with compliant meal breaks, Defendant did not pay premium pay for these missed breaks
5 at Plaintiff's regular rate of pay.

6 15. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with compliant rest breaks because rest breaks were
7 discouraged and Plaintiff was required to remain on call at all times. Despite not being provided
8 with compliant rest breaks, Defendant did not pay premium pay for these missed breaks at
9 Plaintiff's regular rate of pay.

10 16. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked because Plaintiff was required to be
11 on call, on duty, and on premises during meal breaks. Thus, they are owed 30 minutes of unpaid
12 time per shift.

13 17. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with accurate wage statements because the wage
14 statements issued to Plaintiff did not accurately list total wages owed and hours worked, among
15 other things.

16 18. Due to Defendants' failure to pay all wages due to Plaintiff during their employment, it
17 follows that Defendant failed to pay all wages due at the conclusion of Plaintiff's employment as
18 well. Therefore, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for waiting time penalties.

19 19. The applicable Wage Order provides that "[a]ll working employees shall be provided with
20 suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats." It further states that
21 "[w]hen employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the
22 work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable
23 proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not
24 interfere with the performance of their duties."

25 20. Here, although Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees could have performed their job duties
26 while seated, Defendants failed to provide suitable seating. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the
27 Aggrieved Employees should have been provided with seats for use while not actively performing
28 their work duties, but such seating was not provided.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

21. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) for violations of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures outlined in Labor Code section 2699.3.

22. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, an aggrieved employee may pursue a civil action under PAGA after the following requirement have been met:

23. The aggrieved employee has provided written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to the employer (hereinafter “Employee’s Notice”) of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations; and

24. The LWDA has provided notice (hereinafter “LWDA’s Notice”) to the employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the aggrieved employee’s claims. Upon receipt of the LWDA’s Notice, or if the LWDA does not provide such Notice within 65 calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

25. On September 16, 2024, Plaintiff provided written notice by online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants of specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendants, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

26. The 65-day notice period has elapsed, and the LWDA did not provide Plaintiff with written notice that it intends to investigate the alleged violations of the Labor Code. Thus, Plaintiff seeks PAGA Penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees.

27. The Aggrieved Employees are defined as “All other nonexempt, hourly employees, current and former, who were employed by Defendants within one year prior to September 16, 2024, through final disposition of this action.”

///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure to Provide Compliant Meal Periods**

3 **By Plaintiff Against All Defendants**

4 28. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

5 29. Labor Code section 512 and the Wage Orders provide that “an employer shall not employ an
6 employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a
7 meal period of not less than 30 minutes” or “for a work period of more than 10 hours per day
8 without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes”.

9 30. An employer provides compliant meal breaks to its employees “if it relieves its employees
10 of all duty, relinquishes control over their activities and permits them a reasonable opportunity to
11 take an uninterrupted 30-minute break.” (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th
12 1004, 1040 (2012)).

13 31. Not only must an employer affirmatively relieve its employees of all duty during their meal
14 breaks, it also must not “impede or discourage” its employees from taking compliant meal breaks.
15 (*Brinker*, supra).

16 32. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with compliant meal breaks as alleged herein.

17 33. For each day that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with a compliant meal break,
18 Defendants were required to remit premium pay pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7(c), which is
19 one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff’s regular rate of pay. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*,
20 11 Cal. 5th 858 (2021)).

21 34. Defendants failed to pay premium pay at Plaintiff’s regular rate of pay for each day a meal
22 break was missed.

23 35. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover premium pay for missed meal breaks, interest,
24 penalties, attorney fees, and costs.

25 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **Failure to Provide Compliant Rest Periods**

27 **By Plaintiff Against All Defendants**

28 36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

1 37. Labor Code section 226.7 and the Wage Orders requires employers to authorize and permit
2 its employees to take rest periods based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of 10 minutes net
3 per four hours or major fraction thereof.

4 38. Furthermore, “[d]uring rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and
5 relinquish control over how employees spend their time.” (*Augustus v. ABM Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 2 Cal.
6 5th 257, 269 (2016)).

7 39. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with compliant rest breaks as alleged herein.

8 40. For each day that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with a compliant rest break,
9 Defendants were required to remit premium pay pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7(c), which is
10 one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff’s regular rate of pay. (*Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*,
11 11 Cal. 5th 858 (2021)).

12 41. Defendants failed to pay premium pay at Plaintiff’s regular rate of pay for each day a rest
13 break was missed.

14 42. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover premium pay for missed rest breaks, interest,
15 penalties, attorney fees, and costs.

16 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked**

18 **By Plaintiff Against All Defendants**

19 43. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

20 44. Labor Code sections 558 and 1194 and the Wage Orders require an employer to pay
21 employees minimum wages for all hours worked fewer than eight hours in a day and/or fewer than
22 40 hours in a workweek.

23 45. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked as alleged herein.

24 46. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to recover all unpaid wages, liquidated damages, interest,
25 penalties, attorney fees, and costs.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Wage Statement Penalties**

3 **By Plaintiff Against All Defendants**

4 47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

5 48. Labor Code section 226(a) requires employers to provide itemized wage statements to its
6 employees that identify accurate information regarding their compensation. Defendants, as a matter
7 of policy and practice, failed in its affirmative obligation to provide accurate itemized wage
8 statements to Plaintiff in violation of Labor Code section 226(a).

9 49. As alleged herein, the wage statements that Defendants issued to Plaintiff were inaccurate
10 and incomplete.

11 50. Defendants knowingly and intentionally issued wage statements that were inaccurate and
12 incomplete, and the issuance of inaccurate and incomplete wage statements caused injury to
13 Plaintiff in that Plaintiff was unable to accurately verify and/or calculate their wages.

14 51. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to the recovery of wage statement penalties, attorney fees, and
15 costs.

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Waiting Time Penalties**

18 **By Plaintiff Against All Defendants**

19 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

20 53. Labor Code sections 201 and 202 require that an employer provide an employee with all
21 wages due and payable either: (a) immediately upon termination, or (b) within 3 days of the
22 employee's resignation.

23 54. Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed in
24 accordance with Labor Code sections 201 or 202, then the wages of the employee continue as a
25 penalty from the due date at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced, not to exceed
26 thirty days.

27 55. As alleged herein, Defendants willfully did not pay Plaintiff all wages owed at the
28 conclusion of employment.

1 56. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to the recovery of waiting time penalties, interest, attorney fees,
2 and costs.

3 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Violation of Unfair Competition Law**

5 **By Plaintiff Against All Defendants**

6 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

7 58. Defendants' conduct described herein constitutes unfair competition.

8 59. Specifically, Defendants have gained an unfair advantage over other similarly situated
9 businesses by unlawfully reducing their overhead costs by not paying their employees what they are
10 owed.

11 60. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code 17203, Plaintiff is entitled to restitution of all
12 wrongfully withheld wages.

13 61. Plaintiff may recover attorney fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

14 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Private Attorneys General Act**

16 **By Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees Against All Defendants**

17 62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

18 63. PAGA permits Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to recover civil penalties for the
19 violation(s) of the Labor Code.

20 64. As alleged herein, Defendants' conduct violates numerous sections of the Labor Code.

21 65. With respect to violations of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 558 for Defendants' failure to
22 provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with compliant meal periods or compensation in
23 lieu thereof, the penalties in Labor Code sections 558 and 2699 apply.

24 66. With respect to violations of Labor Code section 226.7 for Defendants' failure to provide
25 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with compliant rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof,
26 the penalties in Labor Code section 2699 apply.

27 ///

28 ///

1 67. With respect to violations of Labor Code section 1197 for Defendants' failure to compensate
2 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all minimum wages earned, the penalties in Labor Code
3 sections 1197.1 and 2699 apply.

4 68. With respect to violations of Labor Code section 226(a) for failure to provide accurate wage
5 statements to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, the penalties in Labor Code sections 226.3
6 and 2699 apply.

7 69. With respect to violations of Labor Code section 203 for failure to pay all wages due to
8 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees and the conclusion of their employment, the penalties in
9 Labor Code section 2699 apply.

10 70. With respect to violations of Labor Code section 1198 and the relevant wage order for
11 failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with suitable seating, the penalties in
12 Labor Code section 2699 apply.

13 71. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(k)(1), Plaintiff further seeks public injunctive relief in
14 the form of an Order enjoining Defendants from continuing to violate the California Labor Code in
15 the manner alleged herein.

16 72. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to attorney's fees pursuant
17 to Labor Code section 2699(g).

18 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Retaliation in violation of Labor Code § 1102.5**

20 **By Plaintiff Against All Defendants**

21 73. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

22 74. California Labor Code § 1102.5 prohibits employers from retaliating against an employee
23 "for disclosing information" reasonably believed to be a violation of state or federal law to a
24 government agency or "to a person with authority over the employee, or to another employee who
25 has authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance."

26 75. Plaintiff reported a violation of state or federal law.

27 76. Specifically, Plaintiff made several reports regarding the unpaid wages, meal and rest break
28 violations, and tip violation.

1 77. Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff by terminating his employment because of his reports
2 and demands for action.

3 78. Defendant's conduct constitutes retaliation in violation of Lab.C. § 1102.5.

4 79. Plaintiff may recover civil penalties pursuant to Lab.C. § 1102.5.

5 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy**

7 **By Plaintiff Against All Defendants**

8 80. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the paragraphs above.

9 81. At all times mentioned in this complaint, it was a fundamental policy of the State of
10 California that Defendants cannot discriminate and/or retaliate against any employee on the basis of
11 race, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, sex, and/or
12 engagement in protected activity.

13 82. Based on the actions described above, Defendants terminated Plaintiff for engaging in
14 protected activity.

15 83. Defendants actions were in violation of California Public Policy.

16 84. As a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and
17 will continues to suffer damages, as stated below.

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

20 **First Cause of Action**

- 21 1. Damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7
22 2. Interest
23 3. Attorneys' fees
24 4. Costs
25 5. Other relief the court deems proper

26 **Second Cause of Action**

- 27 1. Damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 226.7
28 2. Interest

3. Attorneys' fees
4. Costs
5. Other relief the court deems proper

Third Cause of Action

1. Damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1194, 1197, and 1197.1
2. Liquidated damages
3. Interest
4. Attorneys' fees
5. Costs
6. Other relief the court deems proper

Fourth Cause of Action

1. Penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 226
2. Attorneys' fees
3. Costs
4. Other relief the court deems proper

Fifth Cause of Action

1. Penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 203
2. Attorneys' fees
3. Costs
4. Other relief the court deems proper

Sixth Cause of Action

1. Restitution of all wrongfully withheld wages
2. Attorneys' fees
3. Costs
4. Other relief the court deems proper

Seventh Cause of Action

1. All applicable civil penalties available pursuant to Labor Code section 2698, et seq.

2. Public injunctive relief in the form of an Order enjoining Defendants from continuing to violate the California Labor Code in the manner alleged herein
3. Attorneys' fees
4. Costs
5. Other relief the court deems proper

Eighth Cause of Action

1. \$10,000 penalty
2. Attorney's fees
3. Costs
4. Other relief the court deems proper

Ninth Cause of Action

1. Back pay and front pay
2. Interest on the above amounts
3. Compensatory damages
4. Punitive damages
5. Attorneys' fees
6. Costs
7. Other relief the court deems proper

DATED: December 16, 2024

FRONTIER LAW CENTER

/s/ Daniel Ginzburg

Daniel Ginzburg

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ALFONSO LOPEZ,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated