

D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
David Keledjian (SBN 309135)
d.keledjian@d.law
Elizabeth Harrier (SBN 319550)
e.harrier@d.law
450 N Brand Blvd., Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff NICOLE ROBLEDO

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

NICOLE ROBLEDO, on behalf of herself and
all others similarly situated, and the general
public,

Plaintiff,

v.

EXCEL CABINETS, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CVRI2405415

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

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198);
3. Failure to Pay Hourly Wages and Overtime (Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198);
4. Failure to Pay Proper Vacation Wages (Lab. Code § 227.3);
5. Failure to Provide Accurate Written Wage Statements (Lab. Code §§ 226(a));
6. Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203);
7. Failure to Indemnify (Lab. Code § 2802);
8. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*);
9. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff NICOLE ROBLED0 (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself, all others similarly situated,
2 the State of California, and the general public, complains and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action against Defendants EXCEL
5 CABINETS, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, (collectively referred
6 to as “Defendants”) for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and California Business and
7 Professions Code. As set forth below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have:

- 8 a. failed to pay them overtime wages at the correct rate;
- 9 b. failed to pay them double time wages at the correct rate;
- 10 c. failed to pay them overtime and/or double time wages by failing to include all
11 applicable remuneration in calculating the regular rate of pay;
- 12 d. failed to provide them with meal periods;
- 13 e. failed to provide them with rest periods;
- 14 f. failed to pay them premium wages for missed meal and rest periods;
- 15 g. failure to pay proper vacation wages;
- 16 h. failed to provide them with accurate written wage statements;
- 17 i. failed to reimburse them with necessary business expenditures; and
- 18 j. failed to pay them all their final wages following separation of employment.

19 Based on these alleged Labor Code violations, Plaintiff now brings this class and
20 representative action to recover unpaid wages, liquidated damages, civil and statutory penalties,
21 restitution, and related relief on behalf of herself, all others similarly situated, and the general public.

22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

23 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case because the monetary
24 damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff from Defendants’ conduct exceeds the minimal
25 jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.

26 3. Venue is proper in the County of Riverside pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
27 sections 395(a) and 395.5 in that liability arose this county because at least some of the transactions
28 that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each defendant is found,

1 maintains offices, transacts business and/or has an agent therein.

2 4. Venue is proper in Riverside County because Defendants' have at all times alleged
3 herein, conducted business in Riverside County, and throughout California. As such, venue is proper
4 in any county in California.

5 **PARTIES**

6 5. Plaintiff NICOLE ROBLED0 is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, an
7 individual residing in the State of California.

8 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant EXCEL
9 CABINETS, INC. is, and at all relevant times mentioned herein, a California corporation doing
10 business in the State of California.

11 7. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as
12 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff
13 will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE defendants when
14 ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that each of the fictitiously
15 named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences, acts and omissions alleged
16 herein and that Plaintiff's alleged damages were proximately caused by these defendants, and each of
17 them. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege both the true names and capacities of the DOE
18 defendants when ascertained.

19 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
20 mentioned herein, some or all of the defendants were the representatives, agents, employees, partners,
21 directors, associates, joint venturers, joint employers, owners, principals or co-participants of some
22 or all of the other defendants, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting within the course
23 and scope of such relationship and with the full knowledge, consent, and ratification by such other
24 defendants.

25 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that, at all relevant times
26 mentioned herein, some of the defendants pursued a common course of conduct, acted in concert and
27 conspired with one another, and aided and abetted one another to accomplish the occurrences, acts
28 and omissions alleged herein.

1 10. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Code
2 of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest among the
3 persons who comprise the readily ascertainable classes defined below and because Plaintiff is
4 unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in managing this case as a class action.

5 11. **Relevant Time Period:** The relevant time period is defined as the time period
6 beginning four years prior to the filing of this action until judgment is entered.

- 7 a. **Hourly Employee Class:** All persons employed by Defendants, collectively or
8 separately, and/or any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in hourly or
9 non-exempt positions in California four years prior to the filing of this action and
ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action (“Hourly Employee
Class”).
- 10 b. **Meal Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked in
11 a shift in excess of five hours during the four years prior to the filing of this action
and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 12 c. **Rest Period Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who worked a
13 shift of at least three and one-half (3.5) hours the four years prior to the filing of
this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 14 d. **Reporting Time Pay Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
15 were required to call in or otherwise show up to work without being paid half of
16 their usual or scheduled day's work from four years prior to the filing of this action
and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.
- 17 e. **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** members who
18 separated from their employment with Defendants during the period beginning
three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is
entered.
- 19 f. **Vacation Pay Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California who
20 earned paid vacation time and/or paid time off without receiving compensation for
all vested paid vacation time during the **Relevant Time Period**.
- 21 g. **Wage Statement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in California during
22 the period beginning one year before the filing of this action and ending when final
judgment is entered.
- 23 h. **Expense Reimbursement Class:** All persons employed by Defendants in
24 California who incurred business expenses during the **Relevant Time Period**.
- 25 i. **UCL Class:** All **Hourly Employee Class** and **Expense Reimbursement Class**
26 members employed by Defendants in California during the four years prior to the
filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
action.

27 ///

28 ///

1 12. **Reservation of Rights:** Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the right
2 to amend or modify the class definitions with greater specificity, by further division into sub-classes
3 and/or by limitation to particular issues.

4 13. **Numerosity:** The class members are so numerous that the individual joinder of each
5 individual class member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact number of
6 class members, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that the actual number
7 exceeds the minimum required for numerosity under California law.

8 14. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all
9 class members and predominate over any questions which affect only individual class members.
10 These common questions include, but are not limited to:

- 11 a. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
12 employees with their rest periods;
- 13 b. Whether Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to provide
14 employees with their meal periods;
- 15 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay premium wages to class members when they
16 have not been provided with meal and rest periods at the appropriate rates of pay;
- 17 d. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum and/or overtime wages to class
18 members for all time worked;
- 19 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay proper vacation wages;
- 20 f. Whether Defendants failed to provide class members with accurate written wage
21 statements as a result of providing them with written wage statements with
22 inaccurate entries for, among other things, amounts of gross and net wages, and
23 total hours worked;
- 24 g. Whether Defendants applied policies or practices that result in late and/or
25 incomplete final wage payments;
- 26 h. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse class members for all necessary business
27 expenses incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- 28 i. Whether Defendants are liable to class members for waiting time penalties under

1 Labor Code section 203; and

2 j. Whether class members are entitled to restitution of money or property that
3 Defendants may have acquired from them through unfair competition;

4 15. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other class members' claims. Plaintiff
5 is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants have a policy or practice of failing
6 to comply with the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code as alleged in this
7 Complaint.

8 16. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative and
9 has no interests that are adverse to, or otherwise conflict with, the interests of absent class members
10 and is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on their behalf. Plaintiff will fairly and
11 adequately represent and protect the interests of the other class members.

12 17. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that
13 they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent class members, are experienced in
14 wage and hour class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf
15 of Plaintiff and absent class members.

16 18. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and
17 efficient adjudication of the class members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the
18 Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to simultaneously and
19 efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the unnecessary duplication of
20 effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the monetary amounts
21 due to many individual class members are likely to be relatively small and would thus make it
22 difficult, if not impossible, for individual class members to both seek and obtain relief. Moreover, a
23 class action will serve an important public interest by permitting class members to effectively pursue
24 the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will prevent the potential for inconsistent
25 or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

26 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

27 19. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a non-exempt employee during the relevant and
28 statutory periods.

1 20. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff
2 and Class Members proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.

3 21. Next, Plaintiff and Class Members were also consistently required to perform work,
4 off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were
5 required to work during unpaid, work-free meal and rest periods. Further, Defendant required Plaintiff
6 and Class Members to conduct work-related activities on their personal cell phones, off the clock, for
7 clocking in and out and safety tests. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the
8 direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

9 22. This uncompensated time caused Plaintiff and Class Members to work in excess of
10 eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Plaintiff
11 and Class Members to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

12 23. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
13 Class Members the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with the California Law.
14 Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Plaintiff and Class Members were denied the
15 opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth and tenth hours of work.
16 Furthermore, Plaintiff and Class Members were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal
17 periods and were required to keep working during meal breaks.

18 24. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30)
19 minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal
20 period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to
21 take their meal periods, or that advised Class Members of their meal and rest period rights; and (3)
22 Defendants' practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their meal and
23 rest periods due to the excessive workload.

24 25. Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Plaintiff and
25 Class Members the opportunity to take rest periods in compliance with the California Law. Plaintiff
26 and Class Members were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4)
27 hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest
28 period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more and

1 third rest breaks for shifts of ten (10) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy
2 that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Plaintiff and Class
3 Members of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class
4 members to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload.

5 26. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members premium pay
6 wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

7 27. Plaintiff and Class Members were not provided with accurate wage statements as
8 mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage
9 statements as "a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or
10 separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing."
11 Additionally, the wage statements issued to Plaintiff and Class Members were not recorded in "ink
12 or other indelible form."

13 28. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as "gross wages
14 earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

15 29. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as "total hours worked
16 by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were
17 not included.

18 30. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as "net wages earned"
19 were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

20 31. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as "all applicable
21 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
22 hourly rate by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including
23 overtime, were not included.

24 32. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with paper pay
25 stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters.
26 Plaintiff's and Class Members' wage statement were only provided in electronic format in violation
27 of Labor Code § 226.

28 33. Plaintiff and Class Members were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in

1 executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members were
2 required to use their personal cell phones for work-related purposes, incurring costs for phone use,
3 internet use, application management, and phone management. Plaintiff and Class members were not
4 reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses.

5 34. Defendants also had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay
6 Plaintiff and Class Members the requisite and accrued vacation time pay in accordance with
7 California Law. Specifically, Plaintiff and Class Members accrued vested vacation time and/or paid
8 time off. However, Defendants failed to pay all accrued vacation time and/or paid time off owed to
9 Plaintiff and Class Members upon their separation from employment.

10 35. Finally, pursuant to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, employers
11 must keep the thermostat between 68 and 78 degrees Fahrenheit. California Wage Order 7 states: "the
12 temperature maintained in each work area shall provide reasonable comfort consistent with industry-
13 wide standards for the nature of the process and the work performed. Where the nature of the
14 employment requires a temperature of less than 60 degrees Fahrenheit, a heated room shall be
15 provided to which employees may retire for warm, and such room shall be maintained at not less than
16 68 degrees Fahrenheit. A temperature of not less than 68 degrees Fahrenheit shall be maintained in
17 the toilet rooms, resting rooms, and change rooms during hours of use." Here, the temperature in
18 Defendants' workspace was well above what is legally allowed under California Law.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

21 **(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1174, and 1198)**

22 **(Plaintiff and Meal Period Sub-Class)**

23 36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if
24 fully alleged herein.

25 37. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members have been
26 non-exempt employees of Defendant entitled to the full meal period protections of both the Labor
27 Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

28 38. Labor Code section 512 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare

Commission Wage Order impose an affirmative obligation on employers to provide non-exempt employees with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period of five hours, and to provide them with two uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods of at least thirty minutes for each work period of ten hours.

39. Labor Code section 226.7 and Section 11 of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“Wage Order”) both prohibit employers from requiring employees to work during required meal periods and require employers to pay non-exempt employees an hour of premium wages on each workday that the employee is not provided with the required meal period.

40. Compensation for missed meal periods constitutes wages within the meaning of Labor Code section 200.

41. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ a person under conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

42. Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order states:

No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an ‘on duty’ meal period and counted as time worked. An ‘on duty’ meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time.

43. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was not subject to a valid on-duty meal period agreement. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not subject to valid on-duty meal period agreements with Defendants.

44. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period Sub-Class** with uninterrupted, duty-free meal periods for at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period, as required by Labor Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order. Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class**

1 members were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth
2 and tenth hours of work. Furthermore, Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not
3 relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep working during
4 meal breaks.

5 45. Plaintiff and **Meal Period Sub-Class** members were not provided with meal periods
6 of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not
7 scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; (2) no formal written meal policy that
8 encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised **Meal Period Sub-Class** members
9 of their meal and rest period rights; and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring **Meal Period Sub-Class**
10 members to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

11 46. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
12 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of failing to pay premium wages to **Meal Period Sub-**
13 **Class** members when they worked five (5) hours without clocking out for any meal period.

14 47. Plaintiff alleges that, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
15 Defendants maintained a policy or practice of not providing Plaintiff and members of the **Meal Period**
16 **Sub-Class** with a second meal period when they worked shifts of ten (10) or more hours and failed
17 to pay them premium wages as required by Labor Code 512 and the applicable Wage Order.

18 48. Moreover, Defendants written policies fail to inform Meal period Class Members of
19 their meal period rights under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

20 49. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Meal Period Sub-**
21 **Class** members additional premium wages, and/or were not paid premium wages at the employees'
22 regular rates of pay when required meal periods were not provided.

23 50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6, 226.7 and 512, Plaintiff, on behalf of
24 herself and the **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest
25 thereon, and costs of suit.

26 51. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
27 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the
28 **Meal Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

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

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

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

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

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

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

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

26
27
28

1 rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more and third rest breaks for shifts of ten (10) hours or more;
2 (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest
3 periods, or that properly advised Plaintiff and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members of their rest period
4 rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring **Rest Period Sub-Class** members to continue
5 working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload.

6 60. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the **Rest Period Sub-Class**
7 members additional premium wages when required rest periods were not provided.

8 61. Pursuant to Labor Code section 204, 218.6 and 226.7, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself
9 and **Rest Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid premium wages, interest thereon, and
10 costs of suit.

11 62. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
12 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Rest**
13 **Period Sub-Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

14 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PAY HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES**

16 **(Lab. Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1197 and 1198)**

17 **(Plaintiff and Hourly Employee Class)**

18 63. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
19 herein.

20 64. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members are or have been
21 non-exempt employees of Defendants entitled to the full protections of the Labor Code and the
22 applicable Wage Order.

23 65. Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during
24 which an employee is subject to the control of the employer, and includes all the time the employee
25 is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so."

26 66. Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt
27 employees at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consist of all hours
28 that an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

1 67. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
2 employee to work for less than the minimum or overtime wage required under the applicable Wage
3 Order.

4 68. Labor Code section 1194.2 entitles non-exempt employees to recover liquidated
5 damages in amounts equal to the amounts of unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon in addition
6 to the underlying unpaid minimum wages and interest thereon.

7 69. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less
8 than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a
9 payroll period.

10 70. Labor Code section 1197.1 provides that it is unlawful for any employer or any other
11 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent or employee of another person, to pay an
12 employee, or cause an employee to be paid, less than the applicable minimum wage.

13 71. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for employers to employ employees under
14 conditions that violate the applicable Wage Order.

15 72. Labor Code section 204 requires employers to pay non-exempt employees their earned
16 wages for the normal work period at least twice during each calendar month on days the employer
17 designates in advance and to pay non-exempt employees their earned wages for labor performed in
18 excess of the normal work period by no later than the next regular payday.

19 73. Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for employers to pay their employees lower
20 wages than required by contract or statute while purporting to pay them legal wages.

21 74. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order require employees
22 to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than one and one-half (1.5) times their
23 respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, all
24 hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and/or for the first eight (8) hours
25 worked on the seventh consecutive day of one workweek.

26 75. Labor Code section 510 and Section 3 of the applicable Wage Order also require
27 employers to pay non-exempt employees overtime wages of no less than two (2) times their respective
28 regular rates of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for all

1 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on a seventh consecutive workday during the workweek.

2 76. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times, Defendants have applied
3 centrally devised policies and practices to her and **Hourly Employee Class** members with respect to
4 working conditions and compensation arrangements.

5 77. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay hourly wages to Plaintiff and **Hourly**
6 **Employee Class** members for all time worked, including but not limited to, overtime hours at
7 statutory and/or agreed rates.

8 78. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were not paid proper wages and
9 overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.

10 79. Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members were consistently required to perform
11 work, off-the-clock for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee**
12 **Class** members were required to work during unpaid, work-free meal and rest periods. Further,
13 Defendant required Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class** members to conduct work-related activities
14 on their personal cell phones, off the clock, for clocking in and out and safety tests. The forgoing and
15 uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages
16 were paid.

17 80. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and **Hourly Employee Class**
18 members have suffered damages in an amount, subject to proof, to the extent they were not paid the
19 full amount of wages earned during each pay period during the applicable limitations period,
20 including overtime wages.

21 81. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204, 218.6, 223, 510, 1194 and 1194.2, Plaintiff, on
22 behalf of herself and **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover unpaid straight time and
23 overtime wages, interest thereon and costs of suit.

24 82. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1194, Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the
25 substantial benefit doctrine, and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and
26 **Hourly Employee Class** members, seeks to recover reasonable attorneys' fees.

27 ///

28 ///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY VACATION WAGES
(Lab. Code § 227.3)
(Plaintiff and Vacation Pay Class)

83. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

84. California Labor Code section 227.3 provides:

Unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated representative, in the resolution of any dispute with regard to vested vacation time, shall apply the principles of equity and fairness.

85. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and members of the **Vacation Pay Class** accrued vacation time, and/or paid time off, during their employment with Defendants.

86. However, Defendants implemented a common policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and **Vacation Pay Class** members for all accrued vacation wages upon separation of employment, in violation of Labor Code 227.3.

87. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the members of the **Vacation Pay Class** are entitled to restitution for all unpaid amounts due and owing to within four (4) years of the date of the filing of the original Complaint until the date of entry of judgment.

88. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the members of the **Vacation Pay Class**, seeks interest thereon pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6, costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

///

///

///

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS

(Lab. Code § 226)

(Plaintiff and Wage Statement Penalties Sub-Class)

89. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

90. Labor Code section 226(a) states:

An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee and, beginning July 1, 2013, if the employer is a temporary services employer as defined in Section 201.3, the rate of pay and the total hours worked for each temporary services assignment. The deductions made from payment of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement and the record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California. For purposes of this subdivision, 'copy' includes a duplicate of the itemized statement provided to an employee or a computer-generated record that accurately shows all of the information required by this subdivision.

91. The Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("DLSE") has sought to harmonize the "detachable part of the check" provision and the "accurate itemized statement in writing" provision of Labor Code section 226(a) by allowing for electronic wage statements so long as each employee retains the right to elect to receive a written paper stub or record and that those who are provided with electronic wage statements retain the ability to easily access the information and convert the electronic

1 statements into hard copies at no expense to the employee. (DLSE Opinion Letter July 6, 2006).

2 92. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
3 limitations period, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members
4 with written wage statements as described above. Additionally, the wage statements issued to class
5 members failed to account for the unpaid minimum wages, overtime, and premium pay wages
6 described above.

7 93. Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class**
8 Members with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE
9 Opinion Letters. Plaintiff's and **Wage Statement Class** members' wage statements were only
10 provided in electronic format in violation of Labor Code § 226.

11 94. Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(8) as the wage statements
12 issues to Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** Members failed to state "the name and address of the
13 legal entity that is the employer."

14 95. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and
15 **Wage Statement Class** members with accurate written wage statements was intentional in that
16 Defendants have the ability to provide them with accurate wage statements but have intentionally
17 provided them with written wage statements that Defendants have known do not comply with Labor
18 Code section 226(a).

19 96. Plaintiff and **Wage Statement Class** members have suffered injuries, in that
20 Defendants have violated their legal rights to receive accurate wage statements and have misled them
21 about their actual rates of pay and wages earned. In addition, inaccurate information on their wage
22 statements has prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required
23 discovery and mathematical computations to determine the amount of wages owed, has caused
24 difficulty and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records, and/or has led to the
25 submission of inaccurate information about wages and deductions to federal and state government
26 agencies.

27 97. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226(e), Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Wage**
28 **Statement Class** members, seeks the greater of actual damages or \$50.00 for the initial pay period in

1 which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, and \$100.00 for each subsequent pay period
2 in which a violation of Labor Code section 226(a) occurred, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of
3 \$4000.00 per class member, as well as awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

4 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL FINAL WAGES**

6 **(Lab. Code §§ 201-203)**

7 **(Plaintiff and Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class)**

8 98. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
9 herein.

10 99. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members have
11 been entitled, upon the end of their employment with Defendants, to timely payment of all wages
12 earned and unpaid before termination or resignation.

13 100. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 201, employees who have been
14 discharged have been entitled to payment of all final wages immediately upon termination.

15 101. At all relevant times, pursuant to Labor Code section 202, employees who have
16 resigned after giving at least seventy-two (72) hours' notice of resignation have been entitled to
17 payment of all final wages at the time of resignation.

18 102. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
19 limitations period, Defendants have failed to timely pay **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class**
20 members all their final wages in accordance with the Labor Code.

21 103. Plaintiff is informed and believes that, at all relevant times during the applicable
22 limitations period, Defendants have maintained a policy or practice of paying **Waiting Time**
23 **Penalties Sub-Class** members their final wages without regard to the requirements of Labor Code
24 sections 201 or 202 by failing to timely pay them all final wages.

25 104. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendants' failure to
26 timely pay all final wages to her and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members has been willful
27 in that Defendants have the ability to pay final wages in accordance with Labor Code sections 201
28 and/or 202 but have intentionally adopted policies or practices that are incompatible with those

1 requirements.

2 105. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 203 and 218.6, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and
3 **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-Class** members, seeks waiting time penalties from the dates that their
4 final wages have first become due until paid, up to a maximum of thirty days, and interest thereon.

5 106. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
6 and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and **Waiting Time Penalties Sub-**
7 **Class** members, seeks awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

8 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY**

10 **(Lab. Code § 2802)**

11 **(Plaintiff and Reimbursement Class)**

12 107. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged
13 herein.

14 108. Labor Code section 2802(a) states:

15 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary
16 expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence
17 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the
18 directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee,
19 at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful.

20 109. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not reimbursed for
21 business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Plaintiff
22 and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were required to use their personal cell phones for
23 work-related purposes, incurring costs for phone use, internet use, application management, and
24 phone management. Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members were not reimbursed for
25 these necessary work-related expenses.

26 110. Accordingly, Plaintiff and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members are entitled to
27 restitution for all unpaid amounts due and owing to within four (4) years of the date of the filing of
28 the Complaint and until the date of entry of judgment.

111. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, and **Expense Reimbursement Class** members, seeks
interest thereon and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6, and reasonable attorneys' fees and

costs pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*)

(Plaintiff and UCL Class)

112. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

113. Business and Professions Code section 17200 defines “unfair competition” to include any unlawful business practice.

114. Business and Professions Code sections 17203-17204 allow a person who has lost money or property as a result of unfair competition to bring a class action in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 382 to recover money or property that may have been acquired from similarly situated persons by means of unfair competition.

115. California law requires employers to pay hourly, non-exempt employees for all hours they are permitted or suffered to work, including hours that the employer knows or reasonable should know that employees have worked.

116. Plaintiff and the **UCL Class** members re-allege and incorporate the FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH, and SEVENTH causes of action herein.

117. Plaintiff lost money or property as a result of the aforementioned unfair competition.

118. Defendants have or may have acquired money by means of unfair competition.

119. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that by committing the Labor Code violations described in this Complaint, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 215, 216, 225, 226.6, 226.7, 227.3, 354, 408, 512, 510, 553, 1175, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2802 as well as applicable Wage Orders, which make it a misdemeanor to commit the violations alleged herein.

120. Defendants have committed criminal conduct through their policies and practices of, *inter alia*, failing to comport with their affirmative obligations as an employer to: provide non-exempt employees with compliant meal and rest periods; pay for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay;

1 and reimbursement for necessary business expenditures.

2 121. Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged in this Complaint amounts to and constitutes
3 unfair competition within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*
4 Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.* protects against unfair competition and allows
5 a person who has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property as a result of an unfair,
6 unlawful or fraudulent business practice to seek restitution on his own behalf and on behalf of
7 similarly situated persons in a class action proceeding.

8 122. As a result of Defendants' violations of the Labor Code during the applicable
9 limitations period, Plaintiff has suffered an injury-in-fact and has lost money or property in the form
10 of earned wages. Specifically, Plaintiff has lost money or property as a result of Defendants' conduct.

11 123. Plaintiff is informed and believes that other similarly situated persons have been
12 subject to the same unlawful policies or practices of Defendants.

13 124. Due to the unfair and unlawful business practices in violation of the Labor Code,
14 Defendants have gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in
15 the State of California that comply with their legal obligations.

16 125. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") permits civil recovery and injunctive
17 relief for "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice," including if a practice or act
18 violates or is considered unlawful under any other state or federal law.

19 126. Accordingly, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 17203,
20 Plaintiff requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
21 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
22 Code and applicable Wage Orders.

23 127. Accordingly, pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200 and 17203, Plaintiff
24 requests the issuance of temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining
25 Defendants, and each of them, and their agents and employees, from further violations of the Labor
26 Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders; and upon a final hearing seeks
27 an order permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their respective agents and
28 employees, from further violations of the Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission

1 Wage Orders.

2 128. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of
3 herself and **UCL Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully
4 belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful
5 and unfair business practices.

6 129. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
7 and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover
8 reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

9 130. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff, on behalf of
10 herself and **UCL Class** members, seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all monies rightfully
11 belonging to them that Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of its unlawful
12 and unfair business practices.

13 131. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine
14 and/or the common fund doctrine, Plaintiff and **UCL Class** members are entitled to recover
15 reasonable attorneys' fees in connection with their unfair competition claims.

16 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **CIVIL PENALTIES**

18 **(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

19 132. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully alleged herein.

20 133. During the applicable limitations period, Defendants have violated Labor Code §§
21 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 212, 213, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1,
22 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802.

23 134. Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of herself
24 and other current and former employees, to bring a representative civil action to recover civil penalties
25 pursuant to the procedures set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 that may, but need not, be brought or
26 maintained as a class action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

27 135. Plaintiff, a former employee against whom Defendants committed one or more of the
28 alleged Labor Code violations during the applicable limitations period, is an aggrieved employee

1 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt
2 hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of
3 Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing
4 through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as
5 “Aggrieved Employees”)

6 136. In addition to the various Labor Code violations alleged herein, The IWC Wage Order
7 requires employers to maintain the temperature in each work area providing reasonable comfort
8 consistent with industry wide standards for the nature of the process and the work performed. The
9 IWC Wage Order states: “the temperature maintained in each work area shall provide reasonable
10 comfort consistent with industry-wide standards for the nature of the process and the work performed.
11 If excessive heat or humidity is created by the work process, the employer shall take all feasible means
12 to reduce such excessive heat or humidity to a degree providing reasonable comfort.”

13 137. Defendants failed to reduce excessive heat to a degree providing employees with
14 reasonable comfort. The temperature in Defendants’ workspace was well above what is legally
15 allowed constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and § 2699(f)(2).

16 138. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code §
17 2699.3. Notice was provided to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”)
18 and 65 days have elapsed without the LWDA providing Plaintiff with any notice of an intent to
19 investigate.

20 139. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff seeks the following civil
21 penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 212, 213, 223, 226.7,
22 226(a), 226.8, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802:

- 23 i. For violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 213, 212, 226.7, 227.3, 246
24 1174, 1194, 1198 and 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee per
25 pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each
26 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor
27 Code § 2699(f)(2));
- 28 ii. For violations of Labor Code § 203, a penalty in an amount not exceeding thirty

(30) days' pay as waiting time (penalties set by Labor Code § 256);

iii. For violations of Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 210);

iv. For violations of Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each initial violation that was either willful or intentional, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was either willful or intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 225.5);

v. For violations of Labor Code § 226(a), if this action is deemed to be an initial citation, two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each employee for each violation. Alternatively, if an initial citation or its equivalent occurred before the filing of this action, one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each employee for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code § 226.3);

vi. For violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50) for each employee for each initial pay period for which the employee was underpaid, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each employee for each subsequent pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalties set by Labor Code § 558);

vii. For violations of Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197 that was intentional and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation of Labor Code § 1197, regardless of whether the initial violation was intentional (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1);

viii. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with Plaintiff's claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, all others similarly situated, and the general public, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. An order that the action be certified as a class action;
- b. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;
- c. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;
- d. Unpaid wages and overtime;
- e. Actual damages;
- f. Liquidated damages;
- g. Unreimbursed expenses;
- h. Restitution;
- i. Declaratory relief;
- j. Pre-judgment interest;
- k. Statutory penalties;
- l. Civil penalties;
- m. Costs of suit;
- n. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and

///

///

1 o. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

2
3 Dated: February 5, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

4
5 

6 _____
7 Emil Davtyan
8 David Yeremian
9 David Keledjian
10 Elizabeth Harrier
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff
12 NICOLE ROBLEDO, and the putative class
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, all other similarly situated, and the general public, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: February 5, 2025

D.LAW, INC.



Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
David Keledjian
Elizabeth Harrier
Attorneys for Plaintiff
NICOLE ROBLEDO, and the putative class

- 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

I am employed in the aforesaid county, State of California; I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 450 N Brand Blvd., Suite 840, Glendale, CA 91203.

John A. Mavros, Esq.
Harrison M. Zator Esq.
Stephanie Crisp
Elizabeth Abina
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP
2050 Main Street, Suite 1000
Irvine, CA 92614
Email: jmavros@fisherphillips.com
Email: hzator@fisherphillips.com
Email: scrisp@fisherphillips.com
Email: eabina@fisherphillips.com

[] (BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the address above. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

[X] (STATE) I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.


Jordan Floyd