

Molly DeSario, Esq. (SBN 230763)
molly.desario@wilshirelawfirm.com
James Yoo, Esq. (SBN 310680)
james.yoo@wilshirelawfirm.com
Ruby Carrera, Esq. (SBN 343745)
ruby.carrera@wilshirelawfirm.com
Pavel Rukavishnikov, Esq. (SBN 357588)
pavel.rukavishnikov@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff
YOCELIN TORRES TORRES

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

YOCELIN TORRES TORRES, individually, and
on behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

OMAR DELI ENTERPRISES, INC., a
California corporation; OMAR ENTERPRISES,
INC., a California corporation; DELI
DELICIOUS FRANCHISING INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

E-FILED
1/3/2025 11:05 AM
Superior Court of California
County of Fresno
By: C. York, Deputy

Case No.: 24CECG04722

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

1. Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages (Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197);
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages (Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7);
5. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Lab. Code § 226);
6. Failure to Provide Paid Sick Leave (Lab. Code § 245, et seq.);
7. Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures (Lab. Code § 2802);
8. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination (Lab. Code §§ 201-203);
9. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.); and
10. Civil Penalties Under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 et seq.).

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff YOCELIN TORRES TORRES (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have
2 evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for
3 further investigation and discovery, individually and on behalf of all other members of the public
4 similarly situated, alleges as follows:

5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants OMAR DELI
7 ENTERPRISES, INC., OMAR ENTERPRISES, INC., DELI DELICIOUS FRANCHISING INC.,
8 and DOES 1 through 10 (“Defendants”) in California as a nonexempt employee paid hourly from
9 approximately August 2023 until September 2024.

10 2. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new
11 Plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v.*
12 *American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law, as well
13 as to add additional claims.

14 3. Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that Defendants are, and at all times
15 herein mentioned, were:

16 (a) Business entities qualified to do business and actually conducting business in
17 numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Fresno
18 County; and,

19 (b) The former employers of Plaintiff and the current and/or former employer of
20 the Class Members because Defendants engaged Plaintiff and the Class to
21 work; and/or suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Class to work, and/or
22 controlled or had the power and authority to control their wages, hours, or
23 working conditions;

24 4. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
25 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts, and omissions as described in each and all of the
26 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and of the Class. Further, Defendants are
27 responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of
28 “respondeat superior.”

1 5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued
2 herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each
3 of the Doe Defendants were in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by
4 Plaintiff and the Class as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true
5 names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with
6 appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary. At all times mentioned herein, Does 1-10,
7 inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the
8 jurisdiction of, and/or injured Plaintiff and a significant number of the Class Members in the State
9 of California.

10 6. Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct,
11 policies, practices, acts, and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as
12 the employer of Plaintiff and of the Class. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the
13 unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of “respondeat superior.”

14 7. Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that, at all relevant times, each
15 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the
16 other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages,
17 hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all
18 relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director,
19 controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor-in-interest and/or
20 predecessor-in-interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of
21 the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all
22 of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below.
23 Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the
24 scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about,
25 and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other
26 Defendants. Defendants are thus jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff and the Class Members on
27 the claims asserted in this action.

28 8. Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that, at all relevant times, Defendants,

1 and each of them, were joint employers of Plaintiff and of the Class Members because they exerted
2 significant control over these employees and dictated essential terms and conditions of employment,
3 including, but not limited to, setting employees' wages and paying them, sending employees to
4 different Defendants' places of business to perform part of their job duties there, and to work some
5 of their work hours at different Defendants' locations, as well as to use various equipment types at
6 those Defendants' locations. Defendants are thus jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff and the
7 Class Members on the claims asserted in this action.

8 9. Plaintiff also alleges, on information and belief, that Defendants operated as an
9 integrated enterprise and are thus jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff and the Class Members on
10 the claims asserted in this action because they had (1) common ownership or financial control, (2)
11 common management, (3) centralized control of labor relations, and/or (4) an interrelation of
12 operations of Defendants.

13 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and, on that basis, alleges that those Defendants
14 who are individuals ("Alter Ego Defendants") so dominated and controlled Defendants who were
15 business entities (collectively, "Corporate Defendants") that failure to disregard the purported
16 corporate entities, partnerships, companies, and/or organizations would sanction fraud and promote
17 injustice.

18 11. Specifically, the Alter Ego Defendants:

- 19 (a) treated the assets of the Corporate Defendants, as if they were their own;
- 20 (b) diverted assets from the Corporate Defendants to themselves to the detriment
21 of the creditors of the Corporate Defendants;
- 22 (c) were original incorporators and/or officers and/or directors and/or partners
23 and/or trustees and/or members and/or managing members of the Corporate
24 Defendants;
- 25 (d) were and/or are shareholders and/or members and/or managing members
26 and/or have had equitable ownership in and/or financial interest in the
27 Corporate Defendants;
- 28 (e) used the Corporate Defendants as a mere instrumentality or "alter ego";

(f) have preferred themselves, or their personal creditors, or creditors with personal guarantees as creditors of the Corporate Defendants, to the detriment of Plaintiff and of the Class Members;

(g) actively participated in or consciously ratified the acts, conduct, and event that the Corporate Defendants contend gives rise herein to any defense.

12. Recognition of the separate existence of the Alter Ego Defendants would perpetrate a fraud and/or circumvent a statute and/or otherwise accomplish some wrongful or inequitable purpose. The facts are such that adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of the Alter Ego Defendants would, under the circumstances of this case, sanction a fraud or promote injustice or permit the Alter Ego Defendants to evade their liability;

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and, on that basis, alleges that the Corporate Defendants, and each of them, and at all times herein mentioned:

(a) were mere shells and shams without capital, assets, stock, or stockholders, and conduits, through which the Alter Ego Defendants carried on their business in the corporate name, exactly as before incorporation, exercising complete control and dominance of such business to such an extent that any individuality or separateness of the Corporate Defendants and the Alter Ego Defendants never existed;

(b) were conceived, intended, and used by the Alter Ego Defendants to avoid individual liability and for the purpose of substituting a financially insolvent business entity in the place of Alter Ego Defendants;

(c) were so inadequately capitalized that, compared with the business to be done by them and the risks of loss attendant thereon, its capitalization was illusory or trifling;

(d) had no stock authorized to be issued or issued, nor has any permit for issuance of stock been applied for;

(e) were being used, and their assets being used, by Alter Ego Defendants, for their personal uses, causing assets of the Corporate Defendants to be

transferred to Alter Ego Defendants without adequate consideration, and withdrawing funds from the Corporate Defendants' bank accounts for personal use; and/or

(f) were completely controlled, dominated, managed, and operated by the Alter Ego Defendants, who intermingled the Corporate Defendants' assets to suit the convenience the Alter Ego Defendants.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter because Plaintiff brings this Complaint for various violations of the Labor Code (including a claim pursuant to the Private Attorney General Act of 2004) and California Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") orders, Defendants are business entities operating in California, and Plaintiff is a California resident.

15. This class action is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages, penalties, and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, section 10. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction. Plaintiff's share of damages, penalties, and other relief sought in this action does not exceed \$75,000.

16. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants are either citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. There is no basis for federal diversity jurisdiction in this action because there is no complete diversity, and this case falls within the statutory exceptions to "minimal diversity" jurisdiction under the Class action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(4). Upon information and belief, two-thirds or more of the Class Members and Defendants are citizens of California and/or (a) two-thirds of the Class Members and Defendants are citizens of California; (b) the alleged wage and hour violations occurred in California; (c) significant relief is being sought against Defendants, whose violations

1 of California wage and hour laws form a significant basis for Plaintiff's claims; and (d) no other
2 class action has been filed within the past three (3) years on behalf of the same proposed class
3 against Defendants asserting the same or similar factual allegations.

4 17. Venue is proper in this judicial district because Defendants maintain offices, have
5 agents, and/or transact business in the County of Fresno, California.

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

7 18. Plaintiff worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee paid
8 hourly. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at least five days in a workweek and at
9 least seven hours per day, but Plaintiff regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday and
10 more than forty (40) hours in a workweek due to unstable schedule that was hard to predict.

11 19. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants for Labor Code violations and unfair
12 business practices stemming from Defendants' failure to pay for all hours worked (including
13 minimum, straight time and overtime wages), failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take
14 meal/rest periods, failure to pay reporting time premiums, failure to reimburse for business
15 expenses, failure to pay all wages at termination, failure to provide paid sick leave, and failure to
16 furnish accurate wage statements. Defendants' managers also engaged in systematic and
17 widespread altering of time records to hide violations of the Labor Code. As discussed below,
18 Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants were typical and illustrative.

19 20. Plaintiff brings the First through Ninth Causes of Action individually and as a class
20 action on behalf of himself and certain current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter
21 collectively referred to as the "Class" or "Class Members," and defined more fully below). The
22 Class consists of Plaintiff and all other persons who have been employed by any Defendant in
23 California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations period
24 applicable to the claims pleaded here.

25 21. Plaintiff brings the Tenth Cause of Action as a representative action under the Labor
26 Code Private Attorneys Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698 et seq. ("PAGA") to recover civil
27 penalties that are owed to Plaintiff, the State of California, and past and present non-exempt
28

employees employed by Defendants in the State of California during the statute of limitations period for their PAGA claim (herein after referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

22. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Fresno County. As such and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are subject to the Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the IWC, and the California Business & Professions Code.

23. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed to comply with the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders with respect to Plaintiff and the Class and instead maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of including, but not limited to, the following violations on a regular basis:

(a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages; for example, Defendants:

- 1) required employees to perform work off-the-clock, without compensation; and/or
- 2) failed to pay for all hours worked and failed to pay some of this unpaid work at the overtime rate, as required; and/or
- 3) required them to continue working during unpaid meal and rest periods; and/or
- 4) failed to maintain accurate records of the hours worked.

(b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods; for example, Defendants:

- 1) required employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work. Due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Plaintiff periodically worked during meal periods and/or took late meal breaks, as well as worked through meal periods while clocked out. For a long period of her employment, Plaintiff did not

1 take a second meal break when she worked more than 10 hours;
2 and/or

3 2) continued to assert control over employees by requiring, pressuring,
4 or encouraging them to perform work tasks, which could not be
5 completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods;
6 and/or

7 3) denied employees permission to take a meal period and/or to leave
8 the premises for meal periods;

9 4) failed to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or
10 missed and/or denied employees opportunities to do their own time-
11 keeping;

12 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
13 periods; for example, Defendants:

14 1) required employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day
15 without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-
16 minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of
17 work (or major fraction of four hours). For instance, Plaintiff tried to
18 take her rest breaks, but supervisors saw her on camera and pressured
19 her to continue working; and/or

20 2) failed to compensate employees for rest periods that were not
21 authorized or permitted; and/or

22 3) continued to assert control over employees by requiring, pressuring,
23 or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be
24 completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods.

25 (d) Falsifying and/or altering time records to avoid paying for all hours worked,
26 overtime rates, and meal and rest break penalties;

27 (e) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
28 containing all the information required by the Labor Code and IWC Wage

Orders, such as the correct name and address of the legal entity of the Defendants, paid sick leave balance, total hours worked, rest and meal break premiums, among other things;

- (f) Failing to provide paid sick leave as required by the Healthy Workplaces, Healthy Families Act of 2014 under California Labor Code § 245, et seq.;
- (g) Failing to indemnify employees for work-related expenses, such as having to use Plaintiff's personal cell phone for work-related communications and to pay for food-handling certification, among other things;
- (h) Failing to timely pay employees their final wages due upon separation of employment, including, but not limited to, all expenditures, minimum wages, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal and rest period premium wages.

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

25. As a result of these violations of Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class suffered injury because, among other things:

- (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they were entitled;
- (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;
- (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were entitled;

- (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, straight time, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages owed to them;
- (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;
- (g) by understating the wages truly due to them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wage rates to which Plaintiff and the Class were entitled, and Plaintiff and the Class were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

26. Thus, Plaintiff and the Class are owed the amounts provided for in Labor Code § 226(e) and injunctive relief under Labor Code § 226(h).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

27. Plaintiff brings certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

28. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

29. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

All persons who worked for any Defendant in California as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before

1 the filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending on the first day of trial
2 in this matter.

3 30. At all material times, Plaintiff was a member of the Class.

4 31. Plaintiff undertook this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
5 conditions of all Class Members.

6 32. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is
7 readily ascertainable:

8 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
9 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The
10 membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however,
11 the Class is estimated to be greater than forty (40) individuals and the identity
12 of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants'
13 records.

14 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the
15 interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined
16 community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims are typical of all Class Members'
17 claims as demonstrated herein.

18 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly, and adequately protect the
19 interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-defined
20 community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff
21 has no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class Member. Plaintiff's
22 attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class
23 action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and
24 throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys'
25 fees that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of
26 this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

27 (d) Superiority: A Class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
28 and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
- 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the Class;
- 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and,
- 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

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

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

- (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages;
- (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class Members;
- (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages to Class Members;
- (d) Failed to provide Class Members with accurate wage statements;
- (e) Failed to provide Class Members with paid sick leave and failed to accrue

an additional one hour of sick leave for every 30 hours worked in 2024

- (f) Failed to indemnify Class Members for expenditures;
- (g) Failed to timely pay all wages at termination;
- (h) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a result of their illegal conduct as described above.

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

- (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
- (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the class before the Court;
- (d) Plaintiff, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;
- (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for the injuries sustained;
- (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of:
 - 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or,
 - 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members

not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

37. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and IWC Wage Orders, payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a payroll period is unlawful. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

38. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiff and the Class compensation for all hours they worked. For example, Plaintiff sometimes worked during meal and rest periods without due compensation and worked off the clock without compensation. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above,

Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code § 1194, and any additional applicable Wage Orders that require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

39. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover minimum and straight time wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

46. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

1 47. California Labor Code §§510, 1194 and 1198 require employers to pay at least
2 minimum wage for all hours worked, pay overtime wages payable at the rate of at least one and
3 one-half times the regular rate of pay for more than eight hours in one workday or more than forty
4 hours in one workweek. Employees are entitled to double overtime wages payable at the rate of at
5 least twice the regular rate of pay for work in excess of twelve hours in one workday or work in
6 excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

7 48. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and the Class have worked more than eight
8 hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, as employees of Defendants.
9 For instance, Plaintiff sometimes worked during meal and rest periods without due compensation.
10 Some of this work should have been compensated at the overtime rate.

11 49. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class
12 overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the maximum hours permissible
13 by law as required by Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198.

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

19 51. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
20 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
21 Plaintiff and the Class.

22 52. Plaintiff and the Class also request recovery of overtime compensation according to
23 proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a), as well as the assessment
24 of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or other
25 statutes.

26 53. Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all wages due and
27 payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall pay to each
28 employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all overtime hours

1 worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class with all
2 compensation due, in violation of Labor Code § 204.

3 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

5 54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above
6 paragraphs.

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

14 56. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiff
15 and the Class with both meal periods as required by California law. For instance, due to
16 understaffing and heavy workloads, Plaintiff periodically worked during meal periods and/or took
17 late meal breaks, as well as worked through meal periods while clocked out. Additionally, Plaintiff
18 did not take a second meal break when she worked more than 10 hours. By their failure to permit
19 and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact
20 that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods),
21 Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

22 57. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of
23 additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s), plus
24 interest thereon.

25 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

27 58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above
28 paragraphs.

59. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Labor Code § 512, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of ten minutes each for each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks, as required, is itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Labor Code § 226.7 for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated under any Wage Order.

60. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest breaks when employees worked more than four hours in a workday. For instance, Plaintiff tried to take her rest breaks, but supervisors saw her on camera and pressured her to continue working. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiff and the Class to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable Wage Orders.

61. Under California law, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday they were not provided with all required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

63. At all material times set forth herein, Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on

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

7 64. In addition, California Labor Code § 246(i) required employers to provide an
8 employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time
9 off leave employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either the employee's itemized wage
10 statement described in Section 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with
11 the employee's payment of wages. If employer provides unlimited paid sick leave or unlimited paid
12 time off to an employee, the employer may satisfy this section by indicating on the notice or the
13 employee's itemized wage statement "unlimited."

14 65. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
15 complete and accurate wage statements compliant with these Labor Code sections. For example,
16 Plaintiff's paystubs did not list the accurate the name and address of the legal entity of the
17 Defendants, paid sick leave balance, proper accrual of sick leave, total hours worked, and meal and
18 rest break premiums, among other things.

19 66. As a result of Defendants' violation of Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 246(i), Plaintiff
20 and the Class have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

21 67. Specifically, Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been injured by
22 Defendants' intentional violations of California §§ 226(a) and 246(i) because they were denied both
23 their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage
24 statements under Labor Code § 226(a).

25 68. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiff and the Class is difficult and
26 time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiff and the Class were also injured as a
27 result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following
28

Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

69. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 246(i), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

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

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Paid Sick Leave)

71. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

72. California Senate Bill (SB) 616 went into effect on January 1, 2024, and amended California Labor Code sections 245.5, 246, and 246.5, increasing the minimum required amount of paid sick leave for California employers to 40 hours or five days, whichever is greater. SB 616 also details the way in which employee accrue paid sick leave. Employers can select any of the following methods by which employees can accrue paid sick leave (1) one hour of paid sick leave for every 30 hours worked; (2) front loading of paid sick leave to give employees an up-front accrual of 40 hours (or five days) of paid sick leave at the start of their employment and each 12 months thereafter; or (3) at a rate other than one hour for every 30 hours worked provided that the accrual is regular and results in at least 24 hours (or three days) of paid sick leave by the 120th day of employment and 40 hours (or five days) of paid sick leave by the 200th day of employment. (Amending Lab. Code. § 246)

73. Plaintiff alleges, that Defendants have or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Plaintiff with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws (including, without limitation, Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*) and failed to accrue an additional one hour of sick leave for employees for every 30 hours worked in 2024.

74. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that Defendants also did not permit its use upon request by Plaintiff as required under Labor Code § 246.5. As such, Defendants would be

1 liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections
2 558 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys'
3 fees and costs.

4 75. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
5 247 and 248.5.

6 76. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, expenses, and costs
7 of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 248.5.

8 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures)**

10 77. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above
11 paragraphs.

12 78. As set forth above, Plaintiff and the Class were required to incur substantial
13 necessary expenditures and losses in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their
14 obedience to directions of Defendants.

15 79. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802, by failing to pay and indemnify Plaintiff
16 and the Class for necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge
17 of their duties or of their obedience to directions of Defendants, including but not limited to use of
18 Plaintiff's personal cell phone for work-related communications and to pay for food-handling
19 certification.

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

22 81. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, expenses, and costs
23 of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(c) and interest pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(b).

24 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of** 26 **Discharged Employees – Waiting Time Penalties)**

27 82. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above
28 paragraphs.

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

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

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

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

87. The Class is entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

88. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, the Class is also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

///

///

///

///

NINETH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Violations of California

Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

89. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

90. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

91. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Class Members, and to the general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

92. Defendants’ activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

93. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described above in the foregoing causes of action are unlawful and in violation of public policy; and are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

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

95. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered monetary injury as a direct result of Defendants’ wrongful conduct.

96. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled to, and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the

1 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiff and the Class have been deprived, by
2 means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and
3 the Class are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of
4 Defendants in order to recover restitution.

5 97. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, is further
6 entitled to, and does, seek a declaration that the above-described business practices are unfair,
7 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them, from
8 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the
9 future.

10 98. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, has no plain,
11 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members suffered as
12 a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result
13 of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
14 and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
15 harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
16 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

17 99. Plaintiff also alleges that, if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
18 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance, and other
19 withholdings.

20 100. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and
21 putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants
22 during a period that commences four years and 178 days prior to the filing of this complaint; a
23 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Class
24 Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and
25 other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**(By Plaintiff Against All Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys
General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698, et seq.)**

101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges, as if fully stated herein, the above paragraphs.

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

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

104. On October 28, 2024, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff also paid the filing fee. Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-1058734-24 (*Yocelin Torres Torres v. Omar Deli Enterprises, Inc.* et al.). More than 65 days passed, and The Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Plaintiff hereby commences a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

105. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and similarly situated Aggrieved Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is an amount to be

1 shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted
2 by law.

3 106. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant
4 to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action
5 shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the
8 class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

9 **CLASS CERTIFICATION**

- 10 1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to all of its causes of action;
11 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class; and,
12 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel.

13 **AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§
15 204 and 1194 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay failed to pay Class
16 Members for all hours worked, including minimum wages and straight time wages;

- 17 2. For unpaid wages as may be appropriate;
18 3. For liquidated damages; and,
19 4. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

20 **AS TO THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§
22 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages
23 due;

- 24 2. For unpaid wages at overtime wage rates as may be appropriate; and,
25 3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

26 **AS TO THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§
28 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, for failing to provide meal periods;

2. For unpaid meal period premium wages as may be appropriate; and,
3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

AS TO THE FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7, and the IWC Wage Orders, for failing to provide rest periods;

1. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate; and,
2. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

AS TO THE FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

2. For all actual damages, according to proof;
3. For statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e);
4. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to Labor Code § 226(h), and,
5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

AS TO THE SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code § 246 and 246.5 by willfully failing to provide paid sick leave;

2. For every paid sick leave day/hour unlawfully withheld; and
3. For statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 247 and 248.5; and
4. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

AS TO THE SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 by willfully failing to indemnify employees for expenditures;
2. For unpaid wages or unreimbursed business expenses as may be appropriate; and,
3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

///

AS TO THE EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed in a timely manner upon separation of employment;

2. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for former employees who have left Defendants' employ; and,

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

AS TO THE NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. by the foregoing violations.

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

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

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

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

AS TO THE TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime), failing to provide meal periods and pay the correct amount of meal period premium wages, failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay the correct amount of rest period premium wages, failing to pay all earned wages twice per month, failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failing to pay all final wages to terminated employees, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to provide paid sick leave, and failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenditures;

2. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

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

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

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

AS TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

1. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due or as provided by law;

2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and/or Labor Code § 1194(a) and/or Labor Code § 2699(g) or as otherwise provided by law as to all causes of action that allow recovery of attorney's fees;

3. For a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury; and

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

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 3, 2025

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

By: 
Molly DeSario, Esq.
James Yoo, Esq.
Ruby Carrera, Esq.
Pavel Rukavishnikov, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

I, **Manuel Martinez**, state that I am employed in the aforesaid County, State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 3055 Wilshire Blvd., 12th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010.

On **January 3, 2025**, I served the foregoing document on the interested parties as addressed below and via one of the methods of service set forth below:

FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

Paul Bauer
SAGASER, WATKINS & WIELAND PC
5260 N. Palm Ave. Suite 400
Fresno, CA 93704
Emails: Paul@sw2law.com; Valerie@sw2law.com

Attorneys for Defendants OMAR DELI ENTERPRISES, INC. and OMAR ENTERPRISES, INC.

Gregory J. Norys
COLEMAN & HOROWITT, LLP
499 W. Shaw Ave. Suite 116
Fresno, California 93704
Emails: gnorys@ch-law.com; spetersen@ch-law.com; jstafford@ch-law.com

Attorneys for Defendant DELI DELICIOUS FRANCHISING INC.

[X] (By E-mail or Electronic Transmission) Based on Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(g), a court order, or an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

(By Personal Service) I caused such envelope to be hand-delivered to the above address.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 3, 2025, at Los Angeles, California.

Paul Marley

Manuel Martinez