



1 DAVID GLENN SPIVAK (SBN 179684)

david@spivaklaw.com

2 THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

8605 Santa Monica Bl

3 PMB 42554

West Hollywood, CA 90069

4 Telephone: (213) 725-9094

5 Facsimile: (213) 634-2485

6 WALTER L. HAINES (SBN 71075)

walter@uelglaw.com

7 UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP

8 8605 Santa Monica Bl.

PMB 63354

9 West Hollywood, CA 90069

10 Telephone: (562) 256-1047

11 Facsimile: (562) 256-1006

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff(s),

DANIEL CORONADO, and all others similarly situated

13 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

14 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ**

15 **(UNLIMITED JURISDICTION)**

16 DANIEL CORONADO, on behalf of himself
17 and all others similarly situated, and the general
18 public, and as an “aggrieved employee” on
19 behalf of other “aggrieved employees” and the
20 State of California under the Labor Code Private
Attorneys General Act of 2004,

21 *Plaintiff(s),*

22 vs.

23 CUMULATIVE EFFECT LLC DBA 1800-
24 GOT-JUNK, a California limited liability
company; ENDLESS PURSUIT
25 CORPORATION, a California corporation; and
DOES 1–50, inclusive,

26 *Defendant(s).*

Case No. 24CV03434

CLASS ACTION

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Failure to Pay All Wages Earned for All Hours Worked and Other Compensable Hours at the Correct Rates of Pay (Lab. Code §§ 221, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 1198);
4. Wage Statement Penalties (Lab. Code § 226);
5. Waiting Time Penalties (Lab. Code § 203);
6. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; and



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

7. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code §§ 2898, *et seq.*)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff, Daniel Coronado (hereafter “Plaintiff” or “Coronado”), on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, the general public, and as an “aggrieved employee” on behalf of other “aggrieved employees” and the State of California under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, complains and alleges as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action for alleged violations of the California Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 9-2001 (hereafter “the Wage Order”), and the California Business and Professions Code against Defendants Cumulative Effect LLC dba 1800-Got-Junk, a California limited liability company, Endless Pursuit Corporation, a California corporation, and Does 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”).

2. As set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants are liable to him and other similarly situated workers for unpaid wages, statutory penalties, interest, and related relief. These claims are based on Defendants’ failures to:

(A) Pay all wages, including minimum, regular, overtime and doubletime wages, earned for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay;

(B) Provide all meal periods;

(C) Authorize and permit all rest breaks;

(D) Pay premium wages for unprovided meal periods;

(E) Pay premium wages for unprovided rest breaks;

(F) Only deduct wages lawfully;

(G) Issue only accurate and complete itemized wage statements; and

(H) Timely pay wages upon termination of employment

Accordingly, Plaintiff now seeks to recover unpaid wages, interest, liquidated damages, restitution, statutory and civil penalties, attorneys’ fees, costs, and related relief through this class



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 action.

2 **II. THE PARTIES**

3 3. Plaintiff Daniel Coronado is a resident of California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff
4 was an “employee” within the meaning of Title 8 California Code of Regulations § 11050 and an
5 “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699 (c).

6 4. Defendant Cumulative Effect LLC dba 1800-Got-Junk is a limited liability
7 company organized and existing under the laws of California and also a citizen of California based
8 on Plaintiff’s information and belief.

9 5. Defendant Endless Pursuit Corporation is a corporation organized and existing
10 under the laws of California and also a citizen of California based on Plaintiff’s information and
11 belief.

12 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extents of
13 participation in the conduct alleged herein of the Defendants sued as DOES 1-50, inclusive, but
14 is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said Defendants are legally responsible for the
15 wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names.
16 Plaintiff will amend the Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants
17 when ascertained.

18 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
19 herein, all Defendants were the agents, employees and/or servants, masters or employers of the
20 remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting or failing to act
21 within the course and scope of such agency, employment, direction and control, and with the
22 approval and ratification of each of the other Defendants.

23 8. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,
24 Defendants, and each of them, acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy, practice, or a lack
25 of a practice which resulted in Defendants not compensating Plaintiff and the other Class
26 Members or otherwise complying with their rights in accordance with applicable California labor
27 laws as alleged herein.

28 9. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 Defendants and each of them acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy and/or practice, or
2 lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants not paying Plaintiff and other members of the below-
3 described class in accordance with applicable laws as alleged herein.

4 **III. CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

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

10 11. **Class Definition:** The Class is defined as follows: All persons Defendants
11 employed in California as hourly and non-exempt, including navigator and general labor,
12 individuals performing work comparable to the aforementioned, compensated comparably to the
13 aforementioned, individuals in similar positions, at any time during the period beginning four
14 years prior to the filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
15 action (“Class” or “Class Members”).

16 12. **Reservation of Rights:** Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the
17 right to amend or modify the class definition with greater specificity, by further division into
18 subclasses and/or by limitation to particular issues.

19 13. **Numerosity:** The Class Members are so numerous that the individual joinder of
20 each individual Class Member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact
21 number of Class Members, Plaintiff is informed and believes that the actual number exceeds the
22 minimum required for numerosity under California laws.

23 14. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to
24 all Class Members and predominate over any questions which affect only individual Class
25 Members. These questions include, but are not limited to:

26 A. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Class Members for
27 all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum, regular, overtime, doubletime,
28 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages;



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

- 1 B. Whether Defendants unlawfully deducted wages from Class Members;
- 2 C. Whether Defendants failed to provide the Class Members with all meal
- 3 periods in compliance with California law;
- 4 D. Whether Defendants failed to authorize and permit the Class Members to
- 5 take all rest periods in compliance with California law;
- 6 E. Whether Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide the
- 7 class with accurate and complete itemized wage statements;
- 8 F. Whether Defendants willfully failed to provide the class with timely final
- 9 wages;
- 10 G. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair competition within the meaning of
- 11 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq., with respect to the Class; and
- 12 H. Whether Class Members are entitled to restitution of money or property
- 13 that Defendants may have acquired from them through alleged Labor Code violations.

14 15. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other Class Members' claims.

15 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants have a policy and/or

16 practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants failing to comply with the California Labor

17 Code, the Wage Order, and the Business and Professions Code.

18 16. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative

19 in that he has no interests that are adverse to, or otherwise in conflict with, the interests of absent

20 Class Members. Plaintiff is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of Class

21 Members. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of Class

22 Members.

23 17. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that

24 they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent Class Members, are experienced

25 in class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of

26 Plaintiff and absent Class Members.

27 18. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and

28 efficient adjudication of Class Members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to simultaneously
2 and efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the unnecessary
3 duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the
4 monetary amounts due to many individual Class Members are likely to be relatively small and
5 would thus make it difficult, if not impossible, for individual Class Members to both seek and
6 obtain relief. Moreover, a class action will serve an important public interest by permitting Class
7 Members to effectively pursue the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will
8 prevent the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

9 **IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

10 19. IWC Wage Order 9-2001 (“the Wage Order”) applies to “all persons employed in
11 the transportation industry whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other basis” Wage
12 Order, § 1. The Wage Order defines “Transportation Industry” to mean “any industry, business,
13 or establishment operated for the purpose of conveying persons or property from one place to
14 another whether by rail, highway, air, or water, and all operations and services in connection
15 therewith; and also includes storing or warehousing of goods or property, and the repairing,
16 parking, rental, maintenance, or cleaning of vehicles.” Wage Order, § 2(P). At all relevant times
17 during the applicable limitations period, the Defendants, Coronado, and all of the Class Members
18 were covered by the Wage Order because the Defendants operated, and Coronado, and all of the
19 Class Members worked for, one or more establishments operated as a junk transport and disposal
20 business. Accordingly, Coronado and all of the other Class Members are entitled to the protections
21 the Wage Order provides.

22 20. On approximately February 28, 2022, the Defendants began to employ Coronado
23 in Monterey in the position of navigator and general labor. The Defendants continuously
24 employed him in that capacity until on or about May 10, 2024 when his employment ended.

25 21. At all relevant times, the Defendants issued wages to Coronado and all of the other
26 Class Members on a biweekly (26 paychecks/year) basis and paid them by the hour. At all relevant
27 times, the Defendants classified Coronado and all of the other Class Members as non-exempt
28 employees entitled to the protections of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 22. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Coronado and all of the
2 other Class Members for all hours worked at the applicable minimum or regular rates of pay. The
3 Defendants required Coronado and the other Class Members to work through meal periods,
4 though the Defendants did not pay Coronado and the other Class Members for the time or
5 recorded the meal period as taking place within the first five hours of work when the meal period
6 had taken place later. The Defendants required Coronado and the other Class Members to work
7 off-the-clock and without pay taking phone calls from customers. Also, the Defendants were
8 under-staffed. They required Coronado and the other Class Members to complete more time-
9 sensitive tasks in a workday than they could without working overtime hours, doubletime hours,
10 or working through meal periods and rest breaks.

11 23. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Coronado and all of the
12 other Class Members at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over eight in a day, over 40
13 in a week, and for the first eight hours of the seventh day of the workweek. The Defendants
14 required Coronado and the other Class Members to work over eight hours per day, over 40 hours
15 per week, and on the seventh day of the same workweek. The Defendants required Coronado and
16 the other Class Members to work through meal periods, though the Defendants did not pay
17 Coronado and the other Class Members for the time or recorded the meal period as taking place
18 within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place later. The Defendants
19 required Coronado and the other Class Members to work off-the-clock and without pay taking
20 phone calls from customers. Also, the Defendants were under-staffed. They required Coronado
21 and the other Class Members to complete more time-sensitive tasks in a workday than they could
22 without working overtime hours

23 24. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Coronado and all of the
24 other Class Members at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over 12 in a day, and all over
25 the first eight of the seventh day of the workweek. The Defendants required Coronado and the
26 other Class Members to work over 12 hours per day and over eight hours on the seventh day of
27 the same workweek. The Defendants required Coronado and the other Class Members to work
28 through meal periods, though the Defendants did not pay Coronado and the other Class Members



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 for the time or recorded the meal period as taking place within the first five hours of work when
2 the meal period had taken place later. The Defendants required Coronado and the other Class
3 Members to work off-the-clock and without pay taking phone calls from customers. Also, the
4 Defendants were under-staffed. They required Coronado and the other Class Members to
5 complete more time-sensitive tasks in a workday than they could without working doubletime
6 hours.

7 25. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to provide Coronado and all of the
8 other Class Members with all timely 30-minute, off-duty meal periods. As a result of the
9 understaffing and time-sensitive nature of the Class Members' job duties, the Defendants required
10 Coronado and the other Class Members to work through meal periods, though the Defendants did
11 not pay Coronado and the other Class Members for the time or recorded the meal period as taking
12 place within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place later. The
13 Defendants also failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Coronado
14 and all of the other Class Members with meal periods as required by law.

15 26. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to authorize and permit Coronado and
16 all of the other Class Members to take ten-minute, off-duty, paid rest breaks every four hours
17 worked or major portion thereof. As a result of the understaffing and time-sensitive nature of the
18 Class Members' job duties, the Defendants required Coronado and the other Class Members to
19 work through rest periods. The Defendants also failed to pay premium wages for days on which
20 they failed to authorize and permit Coronado and all of the other Class Members to take rest
21 breaks as required by law.

22 27. At all relevant times, the Defendants unlawfully deducted wages belonging to
23 Coronado and all of the other Class Members. The Defendants deducted hours that Coronado and
24 the other Class Members spent in on-duty meal periods.

25 28. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to issue to Coronado and all of the
26 other Class Members complete and accurate wage statements that state all hours worked at the
27 correct rates of pay, and all wages earned. The Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to
28 state on the wage statements they issued to Coronado and all of the other Class Members the



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 unpaid wages discussed above. The wage statements fail to state all minimum wages earned, all
2 regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period
3 premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and related information.

4 29. At all relevant times, the Defendants also failed to timely pay Coronado and all of
5 the other Class Members all earned wages as described above during and at the conclusion of
6 employment.

7 30. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to provide Coronado and all of the
8 other Class Members with toilet and storage facilities, change rooms, and acceptable work
9 temperatures.

10 31. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to maintain accurate employee records
11 of Coronado and all of the other Class Members.

12 32. For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff alleges that as a result of Defendants'
13 unlawful practices and policies, Plaintiff and the Class Members were:

- 14 A. Not provided with all off duty meal periods;
15 B. Not authorized and permitted to take all rest break periods;
16 C. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
17 authorize and permit them to take one or more timely rest periods;
18 D. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
19 provide them with one or more timely meal periods;
20 E. Not paid all wages earned, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular,
21 overtime, and doubletime wages for work performed while clocked out;
22 F. Not indemnified for all necessary business expenditures incurred during
23 the discharge of their duties;
24 G. Not provided with accurate and complete wage statements; and
25 H. Not timely paid all earned and unpaid wages at the time their employment
26 ended.

27 ///

28 ///



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY, DEDUCTING, OR WITHHOLDING ALL WAGES AT THE**
3 **CORRECT RATES**

4 **Lab. Code §§ 221, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198**

5 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

6 33. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

7 34. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Class Members have been non-exempt
8 employees entitled to the protections of both the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

9 **A. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES EARNED FOR ALL HOURS WORKED AT**
10 **THE CORRECT RATES OF PAY**

11 35. Section 2 of the Wage Order defines “hours worked” as “the time during which an
12 employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is
13 suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.”

14 36. Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

15 The following overtime provisions are applicable to employees 18 years of age or
16 over and to employees 16 or 17 years of age who are not required by law to attend
17 school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from engaging in the subject work.
18 Such employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday
19 or more than 40 in a workweek unless the employee receives one and one half
20 (1½) times such employee’s regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours
21 in the workweek. Eight (8) hours of labor constitutes a day’s work. Employment
22 beyond eight (8) hours in any workday or more than six (6) days in any workweek
23 is permissible provided the employee is compensated for such overtime at not less
24 than:

25 (a) One and one-half (1½) times the employee’s regular rate of pay for all
26 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including twelve (12)
27 hours in any workday, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the
28 seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek;

(b) Double the employee’s regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess
of 12 hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8)
hours on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek. The
overtime rate of compensation required to be paid to a nonexempt full-
time salaried employee shall be computed by using the employee’s regular
hourly salary as one fortieth (1/40) of the employee’s weekly salary.



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1
2 37. Section 4 of the Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt employees
3 at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consists of all hours that
4 an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

5 38. Labor Code section 510 states:

6 Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Any work in excess of eight hours
7 in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the
8 first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be
9 compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of
10 pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be
11 compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an
12 employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a
13 workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of
14 pay of an employee. Nothing in this section requires an employer to combine more
15 than one rate of overtime compensation in order to calculate the amount to be paid
16 to an employee for any hour of overtime work.

17 39. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an
18 employee to work for less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order.

19 40. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee
20 less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked
21 during a payroll period.

22 41. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for an employer to employ an
23 employee under conditions that violate the Wage Order.

24 42. In conjunction, these provisions of the Labor Code require employers to pay non-
25 exempt employees no less than their agreed-upon or statutorily mandated wage rates for all hours
26 worked, including unrecorded hours when the employer knew or reasonably should have known
27 that employees were working during those hours. (See *Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.* (2000) 22
28 Cal.4th 575, 585.)

43. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants failed to
compensate Plaintiff and the Class Members for all hours worked, including, but not limited to
minimum, regular, overtime and doubletime wages for all minimum, regular, overtime and
doubletime hours, respectively, that they worked at the correct rates of pay.



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 44. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
2 Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'
3 failure to compensate Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all hours worked at the correct
4 rates of pay as required by California law.

5 **B. UNLAWFUL WAGE DEDUCTIONS**

6 45. Under Labor Code § 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or
7 receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee."
8 The Defendants deducted wages from the wages earned by Coronado and all of the other Class
9 Members for hours spent working or in on-duty meal periods in violation of Labor Code § 221.

10 46. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
11 Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'
12 deduction of wages belonging to Plaintiff and the other Class Members in violation of California
13 law.

14 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
15 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

16 **Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512**

17 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

18 47. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

19 48. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the
20 Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
21 of California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 1198, and the Wage Order.

22 49. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

23 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor fixed by the
24 commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of
25 labor for employees. The employment of any employee for longer hours than those
26 fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

27 50. In relevant part, In relevant part, California Labor Code § 512 states:

28 An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
more than five hours per day without providing the employee with
a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

51. In relevant part, Section 11 of the Wage Order states:

Meal Periods:

(A) 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 the employee.

(B) An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

(C) 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.

(D) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.

(E) In all places of employment where employees are required to eat on the premises, a suitable place for that purpose shall be designated.



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 52. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 226.7 states:
2

3 (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during
4 a meal or rest period mandated pursuant to an applicable
5 statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the
6 Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety
7 and Health Standards Board, or the Division of
8 Occupational Safety and Health.

9 (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period
10 or rest period in accordance with a state law, including, but
11 not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable
12 regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare
13 Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health
14 Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety
15 and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one
16 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
17 compensation for each work day that the meal or rest
18 period is not provided.

19 53. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512 and the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the
20 Class Members were entitled to uninterrupted meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each day
21 they worked five or more hours. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512, they were also entitled
22 to a second 30-minute meal period when they worked more than 10 hours in a workday.

23 54. Defendants intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class Members with
24 all required 30-minute duty free meal periods in accordance with the Wage Order. As a result of
25 the understaffing and time-sensitive nature of the Class Members' job duties, the Defendants
26 required Coronado and the other Class Members to work through meal periods, though the
27 Defendants did not pay Coronado and the other Class Members for the time or recorded the meal
28 period as taking place within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place
29 later.

30 55. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class Members
31 with all timely rest and meal periods. Defendants denied Plaintiff and the other Class Members
32 their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. Furthermore, Defendants
33 failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Class

1 Members with timely meal periods.

2 56. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
3 within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy
4 which resulted in Defendants not providing the and the Class Members with all off-duty meal
5 periods required by California law.

6 57. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members have
7 suffered damages in amounts subject to proof to the extent they were not paid additional wages
8 owed for all meal periods not provided to them.

9 58. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to premium
10 wages for workdays in which one or more meal periods were not provided to them pursuant to
11 California Labor Code § 226.7.

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST BREAKS**

14 **Lab. Code § 226.7**

15 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

16 59. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

17 60. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the
18 Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
19 of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 1198, and the Wage Order.

20 61. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

21 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor
22 fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and
23 the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment
24 of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or
under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

25 62. In relevant part, Section 12 of the Wage Order states:

26 **Rest Periods:**

27 (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take
28 rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However, a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

(B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

63. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 226.7 states:

(b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

(c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

64. Pursuant to the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Class Members were entitled to be authorized and permitted to take net rest breaks of at least ten minutes for each four-hour period of work, or major fraction thereof.

65. Defendants intentionally failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class Members to take all 10-minute rest periods free from any work duties in accordance with the Wage Order. As a result of the understaffing and time-sensitive nature of the Class Members' job duties, the Defendants required Coronado and the other Class Members to work through rest



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 periods.

2 66. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the
3 Class Members to take all timely rest periods. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium
4 wages to Plaintiff and the Class Members for days on which they failed to authorize and permit
5 Plaintiff and the other Class Members to take timely rest periods.

6 67. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the
7 Class Members to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major
8 fraction thereof. Defendants did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the
9 Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. Moreover,
10 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members premium wages on workdays they failed
11 to authorize and permit them to take 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major
12 fraction thereof.

13 68. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
14 within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy
15 which resulted in Defendants not authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and the Class Members to
16 take all rest breaks required by California law.

17 69. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with all required rest breaks in accordance
18 with the Wage Order. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at relevant times
19 within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy
20 which resulted in Defendants not providing the Class Members with all rest breaks required by
21 California law.

22 70. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff the additional wages required by California
23 Labor Code § 226.7 for all rest breaks not provided to him. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
24 thereon alleges that, at relevant times within the applicable limitations period, Defendants have
25 maintained a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy which resulted in Defendants not providing the
26 Class Members with additional wages for all rest breaks not provided to them as required by
27 California Labor Code § 226.7.

28 71. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members have



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 suffered damages in amounts subject to proof to the extent they were not paid additional wages
2 owed for all rest breaks not provided to them.

3 72. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to premium
4 wages for workdays in which one or more rest breaks were not provided to them pursuant to
5 California Labor Code § 226.7.

6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **FAILURE TO ISSUE ACCURATE AND COMPLETE WAGE STATEMENTS**

8 **Lab. Code § 226**

9 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

10 **A. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE AND COMPLETE WRITTEN WAGE**
11 **STATEMENTS**

12 73. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

13 74. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class Members were
14 entitled to receive, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized
15 statement showing:

16 A. Gross wages earned;

17 B. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
18 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under
19 subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission;

20 C. The number of piece rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the
21 employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;

22 D. All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
23 Employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;

24 E. Net wages earned;

25 F. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;

26 G. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, except
27 that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an
28 employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized
statement;



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 H. The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and
2 I. All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
3 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

4 75. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, an employee is deemed to suffer injury
5 if the employer fails to provide a wage statement. Also, an employee is deemed to suffer injury if
6 the employer fails to provide accurate and complete information as required by California Labor
7 Code § 226(a) and the employee cannot “promptly and easily determine” from the wage statement
8 alone one or more of the following:

9 A. The amount of the gross wages or net wages paid to the employee during
10 the pay period or any of the other information required to be provided on the itemized wage
11 statement pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a);

12 B. Which deductions the employer made from gross wages to determine the
13 net wages paid to the employee during the pay period;

14 C. The name and address of the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor
15 contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682 of the California Labor Code, the name
16 and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer during the pay period;

17 D. The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
18 security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; and

19 E. The number of piece-rate units earned and the piece rate.

20 76. “Promptly and easily determine,” as stated in California Labor Code § 226(e),
21 means a reasonable person would be able to readily ascertain the information without reference
22 to other documents or information.

23 77. Similarly, section 6(B) of the Wage Order states

24 Every employer who has control over wages, hours, or working conditions shall
25 semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages furnish each employee an
itemized statement in writing showing:

26 (1) all deductions;

27 (2) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

- (3) the name of the employee or the employee's social security number; and
- (4) the name of the employer, provided all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item. (See Labor Code Section 226.)

This information shall be furnished either separately or as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages.

78. As alleged herein, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly and accurately itemize each employee's gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked, the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee and other requirements of California Labor Code section 226. Defendants failed to state in the wage statements they issued to Plaintiff and the other Class Members all their hours worked and wages earned, including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock after clocking-out (as described above). Defendants knowingly and intentionally did not issue 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, statements to Plaintiff and the Class Members that state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, and all rest break premium wages earned.

79. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with accurate wage statements was knowing and intentional. Defendants had the ability to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with accurate wage statements but intentionally provided wage statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

80. As a result of being provided with inaccurate wage statements by Defendants, Plaintiff and the other Class Members have suffered injury. Their legal rights to receive accurate wage statements were violated and they were misled about the amount of wages they had actually earned and were owed. In addition, the absence of accurate information on their wage statements prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required discovery



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 and mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed, has caused difficulty
2 and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records and/or has led to the submission of
3 inaccurate information about wages to state and federal government agencies. Further, Plaintiff
4 and the other Class Members were not able to ascertain from the wage statements whether
5 Defendants complied with their obligations under California Labor Code section 226(a).

6 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **WILLFUL FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

8 **Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, and 203**

9 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

10 81. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

11 82. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiffs and the
12 Class have been non-exempt employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
13 of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203, and the Wage Order.

14 83. Labor Code § 201 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who
15 is discharged are due and payable immediately at the time of discharge.

16 84. Labor Code § 202 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who
17 quits after providing at least 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable at the time of
18 quitting and that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who quits without providing at least
19 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable within 72 hours.

20 85. The Defendants failed to pay Coronado and all of the other Class Members whose
21 employment ended all of the earned but unpaid wages described above by the conclusion of their
22 employment with Coronado, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages,
23 doubletime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, unprovided rest break premium
24 wages, and related compensation.

25 86. By failing to pay such earned wages to Plaintiff and the Class Members,
26 Defendants failed to timely pay them all earned and unpaid wages in violation of Labor Code
27 § 201 or § 202.

28 87. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failures to timely pay Plaintiff



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 and the Class Members all of their earned and unpaid wages (described above) have been willful
2 in that, at all relevant times, Defendants have deliberately maintained policies and practices that
3 violate the requirements of the Labor Code and the Wage Order, even though at all relevant times,
4 they have had the ability to comply with those legal requirements.

5 88. Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Plaintiffs seeks waiting time penalties on behalf of
6 themselves and the Class, in amounts subject to proof not to exceed 30 days of waiting time
7 penalties for each Class Member.

8 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

10 **Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.***

11 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

12 89. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

13 90. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the
14 Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
15 of the Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

16 91. The unlawful conduct of Defendants alleged herein amount to and constitutes
17 unfair competition within the meaning of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
18 *seq.* Due to their unfair and unlawful business practices alleged herein, Defendants have unfairly
19 gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in California
20 that comply with their legal obligations to compensate employees for all earned wages.

21 92. As a result of Defendants' unfair competition as alleged herein, Plaintiff and the
22 Class Members have suffered injuries in fact and lost money or property. Plaintiff and the Class
23 Members were deprived of minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, doubletime wages,
24 missed meal period premium wages, missed rest period premium wages, and comparable money
25 and property.

26 93. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff and the
27 Class Members are entitled to restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that
28 Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of their unlawful and unfair business



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 practices.

2 94. Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees in
3 connection with their unfair competition claims pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §
4 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine.

5 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **CIVIL PENALTIES**

7 **Lab.Code §§ 2698, *et seq.***

8 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California,**
9 **against all Defendants)**

10 95. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

11 96. The "Aggrieved Employees" are all members of the Class defined above who
12 Defendants employed during the period beginning October 11, 2023, and ending on the date that
13 final judgment is entered in this action.

14 97. Labor Code § 204 states

15 (a) All wages, other than those mentioned in Section 201, 201.3, 202, 204.1,
16 or 204.2, earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice
17 during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the
18 regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any
19 calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month
20 during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and
21 the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st
22 and 10th day of the following month. ...

23 (b) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, all wages
24 earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the
25 payday for the next regular payroll period.

26 (2) An employer is in compliance with the requirements of subdivision (a) of
27 Section 226 relating to total hours worked by the employee, if hours worked in
28 excess of the normal work period during the current pay period are itemized as
corrections on the paystub for the next regular pay period. Any corrections set out
in a subsequently issued paystub shall state the inclusive dates of the pay period
for which the employer is correcting its initial report of hours worked.

(c) However, when employees are covered by a collective bargaining
agreement that provides different pay arrangements, those arrangements shall
apply to the covered employees.



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

(d) The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

98. Defendants paid wages to employees on regular intervals. Defendants, however, failed to pay Plaintiff on such intervals for all wages earned and all hours worked. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants also failed to pay the Aggrieved Employees on such intervals for all wages earned and all hours worked.

99. During the applicable time period, Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 221, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

100. California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of themselves and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code § 2699.3.

101. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff, the State, and the Aggrieved Employees, are entitled to recover civil penalties for each of the Defendants' violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 221, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, and 1198 during the applicable limitations period in the following amounts:

A. For violations of California Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 210).

B. For violations of California Labor Code § 221, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 225.5).

C. For violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for initial violation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 226.3).



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 D. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars
2 (\$50.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for initial violation and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for
3 each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalty amounts
4 established by California Labor Code § 558).

5 E. For violations of California Labor Code § 1174, five hundred dollars
6 (\$500.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each violation of Labor Code § 1174 (penalty
7 amounts established by Labor Code § 1174.5).

8 F. For violations of California Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars
9 (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial and intentional violation and two hundred
10 fifty dollars (\$250.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period
11 (regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed) (penalty amounts
12 established by California Labor Code § 1197.1).

13 G. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1194, and
14 1198, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each initial
15 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for
16 each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)).

17 102. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California
18 Labor Code § 2699.3. By letter dated October 11, 2024, Plaintiff filed written notice online with
19 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and gave written notice by certified
20 mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been
21 violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. A true and correct copy
22 of the notice to the LWDA dated October 11, 2024 is attached as Exhibit A. Plaintiff submitted
23 his LWDA notice with a fee in the amount of \$75.00. The LWDA has failed to take action in
24 response within 65 calendar days of the date of Plaintiff’s notice, but Plaintiff anticipates that the
25 LWDA will provide written notice to Plaintiff informing him that it does not intend to investigate
26 these allegations.

27 103. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
28 Employees are entitled to an award of civil penalties, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs in



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 connection with their claims for civil penalties.

2 **V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

3 104. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class Members, prays for
4 relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

5 A. An order that the action be certified as a class action with respect to
6 Plaintiff's claims for violations of California law;

7 B. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;

8 C. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;

9 D. Unpaid wages, including minimum, regular, overtime, double-time, split
10 shift, vacation, missed meal period, missed rest period, nonproductive time, rest and recovery
11 time, and reporting time wages;

12 E. Liquidated damages;

13 F. Statutory penalties, including waiting time penalties;

14 G. Civil penalties;

15 H. Restitution;

16 I. Declaratory relief;

17 J. Actual damages;

18 K. Pre-judgment interest;

19 L. Costs of suit;

20 M. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and

21 N. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

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

VI. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other Class Members, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

Dated: December 16, 2024

By:



DAVID G. SPIVAK, Attorneys for
Plaintiff(s), DANIEL CORONADO,
and all others similarly situated



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1801 Century Park East
25th Fl
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXHIBIT A



THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

8605 Santa Monica Bl PMB 42554 West Hollywood CA 90069 Mail
1801 Century Park East 25th Fl Los Angeles CA 90067 Office
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
spivaklaw.com Web

SENT BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION, CERTIFIED MAIL, AND EMAIL

October 11, 2024

Attn: PAGA Administrator
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
<http://dir.tflaforms.net>
Via Electronic Submission

Re: Daniel Coronado / Cumulative Effect

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, Daniel Coronado (hereafter “Coronado” or “Complainant”) provides notice that Cumulative Effect LLC DBA 1800-Got-Junk, Endless Pursuit Corporation, and related entities (collectively “the Cumulative Effect Employers” or “the Employers”) violated his rights and those of all other individuals the Cumulative Effect Employers have employed or otherwise contracted with in California as hourly, non-exempt, including navigators and general labor, individuals performing work comparable to the aforementioned, and individuals in similar positions (hereafter the “Aggrieved Employees”) under Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 221, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, and related Labor Code provisions. On behalf of himself and all other Aggrieved Employees, Coronado hereby provides this notice to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency and the Cumulative Effect Employers and their agents and representatives.

At all relevant times, the Cumulative Effect Employers have employed persons, conducted business, and engaged in illegal payroll practices and policies, throughout California. Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees are “employees” within the meaning of Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 9-2001 (hereafter “the Wage Order”) section 2, subdivision (F) and “Aggrieved Employees” within the meaning of Labor Code section 2699(c).

Statement of Facts

On approximately February 28, 2022, the Cumulative Effect Employers began to employ Coronado in Watsonville in the position of navigator and general labor. The Cumulative Effect Employers continuously employed him in that capacity until on or about May 10, 2024 when his employment ended.

At all relevant times, the Cumulative Effect Employers issued wages to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees on a biweekly (26 paychecks/year) basis and paid them by the hour. At all relevant times, the Cumulative Effect Employers classified Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to compensate Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the applicable minimum or regular rates of pay. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods, though the Cumulative Effect Employers did not pay Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees for the time or recorded the meal period as taking place within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place later. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock and without pay taking phone calls from customers. Also, the Cumulative Effect Employers were under-staffed. They required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to complete more time-sensitive tasks in a workday than they could without working overtime hours, doubletime hours, or working through meal periods and rest breaks.

The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to compensate Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over eight in a day, over 40 in a week, and for the first eight hours of the seventh day of the workweek. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over eight hours per day, over 40 hours per week, and on the seventh day of the same workweek. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods, though the Cumulative Effect Employers did not pay Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees for the time. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock and without pay taking phone calls from customers. Also, the Cumulative Effect Employers were under-staffed. They

required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to complete more time-sensitive tasks in a workday than they could without working overtime hours

The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to compensate Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over 12 in a day, and all over the first eight of the seventh day of the workweek. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over 12 hours per day and over eight hours on the seventh day of the same workweek. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods, though the Cumulative Effect Employers did not pay Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees for the time. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock and without pay taking phone calls from customers. Also, the Cumulative Effect Employers were under-staffed. They required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to complete more time-sensitive tasks in a workday than they could without working doubletime hours.

At all relevant times, the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to provide Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely 30-minute, off-duty meal periods. As a result of the understaffing and time-sensitive nature of the Aggrieved Employees' job duties, the Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods, though the Cumulative Effect Employers did not pay Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees for the time or recorded the meal period as taking place within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place later. The Cumulative Effect Employers also failed to pay premium wages for days on which failed to provide Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with meal periods as required by law.

At all relevant times, the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to authorize and permit Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, off-duty, paid rest breaks every four hours worked or major portion thereof. As a result of the understaffing and time-sensitive nature of the Aggrieved Employees' job duties, the Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. The Cumulative Effect Employers also failed to pay premium wages for days on which failed to authorize and permit Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks as required by law.

The Cumulative Effect Employers unlawfully deducted wages belonging to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees. The Cumulative Effect Employers deducted hours that Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees spent in on-duty meal periods.

At all relevant times, the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to issue to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees complete and accurate wage statements that state all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, and all wages earned. The Cumulative Effect Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees the unpaid wages discussed above. The wage statements fail to state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and other required information.

The Cumulative Effect Employers also failed to timely pay Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned wages as described above during and at the conclusion of employment.

The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to maintain accurate employee records of Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

For the reasons stated herein, Coronado alleges the following violations of the Labor Code and the Wage Order on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees:

- (a) The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to pay Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum, regular, overtime, and doubletime wages;
- (b) The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to provide Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all meal periods in compliance with California law;

- (c) The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to authorize and permit Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks in compliance with California law;
- (d) The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to compensate Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to provide them with one or more meal periods as required by law;
- (e) The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to compensate Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to authorize and permit them to take one or more rest breaks as required by law;
- (f) The Cumulative Effect Employers unlawfully deducted wages belonging to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees;
- (g) The Cumulative Effect Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with accurate and complete wage statements;
- (h) The Cumulative Effect Employers willfully failed to timely pay Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned and unpaid wages during their employment with the Cumulative Effect Employers and when their employment ended;
- (i) The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to maintain accurate employment records pertaining to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

Accordingly, Coronado now seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees based on the Cumulative Effect Employers' alleged violations of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The Wage Order

The Wage Order applies to “all persons employed in the transportation industry whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other basis.” Wage Order, § 1. The Wage Order defines “Transportation Industry” to mean, “any industry, business, or establishment operated for the purpose of conveying persons or property from one place to another whether by rail, highway, air, or water, and all operations and services in connection therewith; and also includes storing or warehousing of goods or property, and the repairing, parking, rental, maintenance, or cleaning of vehicles.” Wage Order, § 2(P). At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the Cumulative Effect Employers, Coronado, and all of the Aggrieved Employees were covered by the Wage Order because the Cumulative Effect Employers operated, and Coronado, and all of the Aggrieved Employees worked for, one or more establishments operated as junk transport and disposal business. Accordingly, Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to the protections the Wage Order provides.

Failure To Pay Wages For All Hours Worked At The Correct **Rates of Pay** **(Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198)**

Under Labor Code section 1197, “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.”

In relevant part, section 2(H) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means 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[.]

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1194 states:

- (a) Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of

this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 510 states:

Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.

In relevant part, Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

The following overtime provisions are applicable to employees 18 years of age or over and to employees 16 or 17 years of age who are not required by law to attend school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from engaging in the subject work. Such employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or more than 40 in a workweek unless the employee receives one and one half (1½) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek. Eight (8) hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Employment beyond eight (8) hours in any workday or more than six (6) days in any workweek is permissible provided the employee is compensated for such overtime at not less than:

- (a) One and one-half (1½) times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including twelve (12) hours in any workday, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek;
- (b) Double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 12 hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek. The overtime rate of compensation required to be paid to a nonexempt full-

time salaried employee shall be computed by using the employee's regular hourly salary as one fortieth (1/40) of the employee's weekly salary.

Labor Code § 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

In conjunction, these provisions of the Labor Code require employers to pay employees no less than their agreed-upon or statutorily mandated wage rates for all hours worked, including hours spent working "off-the-clock" (before punching in or after punching out on a time clock) when the employer knew or reasonably should have known that employees were working during those hours. *Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 575, 585.

The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods, though the Cumulative Effect Employers did not pay Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees for the time or recorded the meal period as taking place within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place later. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock and without pay taking phone calls from customers. Also, the Cumulative Effect Employers were under-staffed. They required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to complete more time-sensitive tasks in a workday than they could without working through meal periods, before they clocked in, and after they clocked out.

The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over eight hours per day, over 40 hours per week, and on the seventh day of the same workweek. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods, though the Cumulative Effect Employers did not pay Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees for the time or recorded the meal period as taking place within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place later. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock and without pay taking phone calls from customers. Also, the Cumulative Effect Employers were under-staffed. They required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to complete more time-sensitive tasks in a workday than they could without working overtime hours.

The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over 12 hours per day and over eight hours on the seventh day of the same workweek. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods, though the Cumulative Effect Employers did not pay Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees for the time or recorded the meal period as taking place within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place later. The Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock and without pay taking phone calls from customers. Also, the Cumulative Effect Employers were understaffed. They required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to complete more time-sensitive tasks in a workday than they could without working doubletime hours.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to compensate Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including, but not limited to minimum, regular, overtime, and doubletime wages for all hours they worked at the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Coronado now seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$50 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 510, and \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages (penalties set by Labor Code § 558);
2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1194, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
3. \$100 for each underpaid aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197, and \$250 for each underpaid aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation per pay period (regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed), in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203 (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1) and

4. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Provide Meal Periods
(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198)

In relevant part, section 2(H) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means 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.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1198 states, “The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage Order] is unlawful.”

In relevant part, Labor Code section 512 states:

An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

In relevant part, section 11 of the Wage Order states:

Meal Periods:

- (A) 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 the employee.

- (B) An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.
- (C) 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.
- (D) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.
- (E) In all places of employment where employees are required to eat on the premises, a suitable place for that purpose shall be designated.

In addition, Labor Code section 226.7 states:

- (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

- (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.

At all relevant times, the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to provide Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely meal periods. The Cumulative Effect Employers denied Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. As a result of the understaffing and time-sensitive nature of the Aggrieved Employees' job duties, the Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods, though the Cumulative Effect Employers did not pay Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees for the time or recorded the meal period as taking place within the first five hours of work when the meal period had taken place later. Furthermore, the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods. Accordingly, Coronado now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the Cumulative Effect Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 226.7, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2));
2. \$50 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 512, and \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages (penalties set by Labor Code section 558); and

3. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods
(Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 1198)

Section 2(H) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means 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.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1198 states,

The employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage Order] is unlawful.

Section 12 of the Wage Order provides, in relevant part:

Rest Periods:

- (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However, a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages.
- (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

In addition, Labor Code section 226.7 states:

- (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.
- (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.

The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to authorize and permit Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. The Cumulative Effect Employers did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. As a result of the understaffing and time-sensitive nature of the Aggrieved Employees' job duties, the Cumulative Effect Employers required Coronado and the other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Moreover, the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to pay Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees premium wages on workdays the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to provide Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Accordingly, Coronado now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the Cumulative Effect Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 226.7, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent

violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2));
and

2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

Unlawful Deductions **(Lab. Code § 221)**

Under Labor Code § 221, “It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee.” The Cumulative Effect Employers deducted wages from the wages earned by Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for hours spent working or in on-duty meal periods in violation of Labor Code § 221. Accordingly, Coronado seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 221, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation of Labor Code § 221, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee (penalties set by Labor Code § 225.5).

Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements **(Lab. Code § 226)**

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to provide an employee, either semi-monthly or at the time of each wage payment, with an accurate and itemized written wage statement that shows:

1. Gross wages earned;
2. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
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 his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized statement;
8. The name and address of the legal entity that is 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.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the Cumulative Effect Employers violated Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly, completely, and accurately itemize each Aggrieved Employee's gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked, the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the Aggrieved Employee and other requirements of Labor Code section 226. The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to state in the wage statements they issued to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all their hours worked and wages earned, including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock after clocking-out (as described above). The Cumulative Effect Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees the earned but unpaid wages described above. The wage statements do not state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and other required information. Accordingly, Coronado seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that the Cumulative Effect Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$250 for each aggrieved employee for each

initial violation of Labor Code section 226(a), and \$1,000 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 226.3).

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment
(Lab. Code § 204)

Labor Code section 204 states all wages (other than those mentioned in Labor Code sections 201 and 202) earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. In addition, all wages for work performed in excess of the normal work period must be paid by no later than the following regular payday.

The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to compensate Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for wages earned, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, doubletime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, unprovided rest break premium wages, and related compensation, at the intervals stated above. As a result, the Cumulative Effect Employers failed to timely pay all earned wages due during employment within the time periods set by Labor Code section 204. Accordingly, Coronado now seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that the Cumulative Effect Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 204, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee (penalties set by Labor Code section 210).

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination of Employment
(Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, and 203)

Under Labor Code § 201, if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. Under § 202, if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 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. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. *Id.* The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting. *Id.*

Under Labor Code § 203, if an employer willfully fails to pay without abatement or reduction, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, the wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to pay Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees whose employment ended all of the earned but unpaid wages described above by the conclusion of their employment with Coronado, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, doubletime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, unprovided rest break premium wages and related compensation. By failing to pay Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as set forth above at the end of employment, the Cumulative Effect Employers are liable for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203. Accordingly, on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees, Coronado seeks civil penalties from the Cumulative Effect Employers as follows:

1. For violations of Labor Code § 201, \$100 per aggrieved employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 201 occurred, and \$200 per aggrieved employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 201 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
2. For violations of Labor Code § 202, \$100 per aggrieved employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 202 occurred, and \$200 per aggrieved employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 202 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)); and
3. For violations of Labor Code § 203, \$100 per aggrieved employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 203 occurred, and \$200

for per aggrieved employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 203 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records
(Lab. Code §§ 1174 & 1198)

Labor Code section 1174, which also pertains to recordkeeping, states:

Every person employing labor in this state shall:

...

- (c) Keep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors.
- (d) Keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned.

Labor Code section 1174.5 states:

Any person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of Section 1174 or accurate and complete records required by subdivision (d) of Section 1174, or to allow any member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

Section 7 of Wage Order states,

(A) Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following:

- (1) Full name, home address, occupation and social security number.
- (2) Birth date, if under 18 years, and designation as a minor.
- (3) Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded. Meal periods during which operations cease and authorized rest periods need not be recorded.
- (4) Total wages paid each payroll period, including value of board, lodging, or other compensation actually furnished to the Employee.
- (5) Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay. This information shall be made readily available to the employee upon reasonable request.
- (6) When a piece rate or incentive plan is in operation, piece rates or an explanation of the incentive plan formula shall be provided to employees. An accurate production record shall be maintained by the employer.

Labor Code section 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

The Cumulative Effect Employers failed to compensate Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned and related information. As a result, the Cumulative Effect Employers have failed to accurately maintain all records required by section 1174 and

the Wage Order, including but not limited to Coronado and all of the other Aggrieved Employees' total hours worked, total wages paid, and applicable hourly rates during each payroll period. Accordingly, Coronado seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$500 for each aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code section 1174 (penalties set by Labor Code section 1174.5); and
2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

// /

// /

// /

// /

// /

// /

// /

// /

// /

// /

// /

// /

LWDA / The Cumulative Effect Employers
Re: Daniel Coronado
October 11, 2024
Page 22 of 22

Conclusion

As noted above, this letter constitutes the required notice under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004. Please be advised that Daniel Coronado will seek both reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) in a civil action should the LWDA decline to pursue this matter. This letter also serves as a formal notice under the catalyst theory and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 to resolve this matter before litigation.

Sincerely,



David Glenn Spivak Esq.
david@spivaklaw.com
cc: Mr. Daniel Coronado
Mr. Walter L. Haines Esq.

Cumulative Effect, LLC DBA 1800-Got-Junk
Drew Boyles, Agent for service of process
120 West 157th St.
Gardena, CA 90248

Endless Pursuit Corporation
David Boyles, Agent for service of process
120 West 157th St.
Gardena, CA 90248