

1 D.LAW, INC.
2 Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
3 emil@d.law
4 David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
5 d.yeremian@d.law
6 Roman Shkodnik (SBN 285152)
7 r.shkodnik@d.law
8 Mason Doidge (SBN 352604)
9 m.doidge@d.law
450 N Brand Blvd., Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff BRUNO CRUZ,
11 on behalf of himself and others similarly situated

12 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
13 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO**

14 BRUNO CRUZ, on behalf of himself and
15 others similarly situated,

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 24 HOUR FITNESS USA, LLC, a California
19 limited liability company; 24 HOUR
20 FITNESS, an entity of unknown form; and
21 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

22 Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT
1/8/2025 12:17 PM
By: Alexis Camacho, DEPUTY

Case No. CIVSB2433321

CLASS ACTION

Assigned for All Purposes To:

Hon. S23

Dept.: Donald Alvarez

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
2. Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Under Labor Code § 510;
3. Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
4. Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
5. Failure to Pay Vacation Wages;
6. Failure to Comply with Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246;
7. Reimbursement of Necessary Expenditures Under Labor Code § 2802;
8. Violation of Labor Code § 226(a);
9. Failure to Keep Required Payroll Records Under Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5
10. Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203;
11. Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; and
12. Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff BRUNO CRUZ, (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself and all others
2 similarly situated (collectively, “Employees”; individually, “Employee”) complains of
3 Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

4 INTRODUCTION

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all current and former
6 Employees within the State of California who, at any time four (4) years prior to the filing of this
7 lawsuit, are or were employed as non-exempt, hourly employees by Defendants 24 HOUR
8 FITNESS USA, LLC, a California limited liability company; 24 HOUR FITNESS, an entity of
9 unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50 (all defendants being collectively referred to herein as
10 “Defendants”). Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of them, violated various provisions of
11 the California Labor Code, relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) and
12 California Business & Professions Code, and seeks redress therefore.

13 2. Plaintiff is a resident of California and during the time period relevant to this
14 Complaint was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee within the State of
15 California at Defendants’ facilities and offices in California. Plaintiff and the other Class members
16 worked for Defendants in San Bernardino County or in other nonexempt positions throughout
17 California and consistently worked at Defendants’ behest without being paid all wages due. More
18 specifically, Plaintiff and the other similarly situated Class members were employed by
19 Defendants and worked at Defendants’ offices and other facilities where the conduct giving rise to
20 the allegations in this Class Action Complaint occurred. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff
21 was employed by Defendants and (1) shared similar job duties and responsibilities, (2) was
22 subjected to the same policies and practices, and (3) endured similar violations at the hands of
23 Defendants as the other Employee Class members who served in similar and related positions.

24 3. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Employees in the Class to perform work
25 while remaining under Defendants’ control before and after being on the clock for their daily work
26 shift. Defendants further failed to accurately record time worked by Plaintiff and Employee Class
27 members by rounding hours worked to reflect scheduled shift start and end times as opposed to
28 actual hours worked. Defendants thus failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class members for all hours

1 worked and provided them with inaccurate wage statements that prevented Plaintiff and the Class
2 from learning of these unlawful pay practices. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the
3 Class with lawful meal and rest periods, as employees were not provided with the opportunity to
4 take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal and rest periods as required by the Labor Code.

5 **THE PARTIES**

6 **A. The Plaintiff**

7 4. Plaintiff BRUNO CRUZ has resided in California and during the time period
8 relevant to this Complaint was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee within
9 the State of California.

10 **B. The Defendants**

11 5. Defendant 24 HOUR FITNESS USA, LLC is a California limited liability
12 company with its principle executive offices in Carlsbad, California and has been listed as the
13 employer on Plaintiff's paystubs and personnel file during the relevant time period. 24 HOUR
14 FITNESS USA, LLC lists a mailing address in Carlsbad, California with the California Secretary
15 of State and employs Plaintiff and the Class members at Defendants' offices and facilities in
16 Onatario, California, and throughout California and conducts business throughout California.

17 6. Defendant 24 HOUR FITNESS is an entity of unknown form with its principle
18 executive offices in Carlsbad, California and has been listed as the employer on Plaintiff's wage
19 statements during the relevant time period. 24 HOUR FITNESS does not list a California address
20 with the California Secretary of State, but upon information and belief, employs Plaintiff and the
21 Class members in San Bernardino County, including at Defendants' offices and facilities in
22 Ontario, California, and throughout California and conducts business throughout California.

23 7. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
24 whatever else, of the Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are currently
25 unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of
26 Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
27 designated herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, are legally responsible in
28 some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend

1 this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated herein as
2 Does 1 through 50 when their identities become known.

3 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted in
4 all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, that Defendants carried
5 out a joint scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and that the acts of
6 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants acted in
7 all respects as the employers or joint employers of Employees. Defendants, and each of them,
8 exercised control over the wages, hours or working conditions of Employees, or suffered or
9 permitted Employees to work, or engaged, thereby creating a common law employment
10 relationship, with Employees. Therefore, Defendants, and each of them, employed or jointly
11 employed Employees.

12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 9. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
14 Procedure § 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code § 17203. This Action is brought
15 as a Class Action on behalf of similarly situated Employees of Defendants pursuant to California
16 Code of Civil Procedure § 382. Venue as to Defendants is also proper in this judicial district
17 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 395 *et seq.* Upon information and belief, the
18 obligations and liabilities giving rise to this lawsuit occurred at least in part in San Bernardino
19 County, Defendants maintain and operate company offices and facilities in San Bernardino
20 County, and Defendants employ Plaintiff and other Class members in San Bernardino County and
21 throughout California.

22 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

23 10. The Employees who comprise the Class and Collective, including Plaintiff, are
24 nonexempt employees pursuant to the applicable Wage Order of the IWC. Defendants hire
25 Employees who work in nonexempt positions at the direction of Defendants in the State of
26 California. Plaintiff and the Class members were either not paid by Defendants for all hours
27 worked or were not paid at the appropriate minimum, regular and overtime rates. Specifically,
28 Plaintiff and Employees were not paid for the time that they worked “pre-shift” and “post-shift”

1 without compensation by cleaning and being required to complete assignments before clocking in
2 and after clocking out. Moreover, Defendants required Employees to use their personal cell
3 phones to respond to work demands outside of scheduled work hours, and Employees were not
4 compensated for this time. Defendants also had a uniform policy and practice of rounding time
5 entries to reflect scheduled shift start and end times and scheduled meal period start and end times
6 rather than paying Plaintiff and the Class members for all hours and minutes they actually worked.
7 Defendants generally rounded time entries to the detriment of the Employees, and these
8 unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage
9 statements and payroll checks were created. Plaintiff also contends that Defendants failed to pay
10 Plaintiff and the Class members all wages due and owing, failed to provide meal and rest breaks,
11 and failed to furnish accurate wage statements, all in violation of various provisions of the
12 California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

13 11. During the course of Plaintiff and the Class members' employment with
14 Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed and
15 for all overtime hours worked and were forced to work during their meal and rest breaks.
16 Defendants also failed to maintain timekeeping records for Plaintiff that would permit him to
17 discover the nature and extent of Defendants' unlawful rounding. Additionally, Defendants paid
18 Plaintiff and Employees nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, shift differentials, and/or
19 nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to
20 incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, shift
21 differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for
22 purposes of calculating the overtime wage rate. Therefore, during times when Plaintiff and
23 Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, shift
24 differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all overtime wages by
25 paying a lower overtime rate than required.

26 12. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
27 present, Defendants paid Plaintiff and Employees nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay,
28 shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and belief,

1 Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary commissions,
2 incentive pay, shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the
3 regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating sick pay. Therefore, during times when Plaintiff and
4 Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, shift
5 differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all sick pay by paying a
6 lower overtime rate than required.

7 13. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
8 present, Defendants paid Plaintiff and Employees nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay,
9 shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and belief,
10 Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary commissions,
11 incentive pay, shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the
12 regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating vacation pay. Therefore, during times when
13 Plaintiff and Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive
14 pay, shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all vacation pay
15 by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

16 14. As a matter of uniform Company policy, Plaintiff and the Class members were
17 required to work during their meal and rest breaks which were not compensated by Defendants in
18 violation of the California Labor Code. Plaintiff and the Class members were also not paid
19 regular wages and overtime for the time they were required to comply with other requirements
20 imposed upon them, which they had to complete while working through their meal and rest
21 breaks and without compensation. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class members worked shifts over
22 eight (8) hours in a day and over forty (40) hours in a work week, but they were not paid at the
23 appropriate overtime rate for all such hours, including by being required to perform work duties
24 and tasks without pay and while off-the-clock, and due to Defendants' unlawful rounding. As a
25 result, Plaintiff and the Class members worked substantial overtime hours during their
26 employment with Defendants for which they were not compensated, in violation of the California
27 Labor Code, applicable IWC Wage Orders.

28 15. As a result of the above described unlawful rounding, the daily work demands and

1 pressures to work through breaks, and the other wage violations they endured at Defendants'
2 hands, Plaintiff and the Class members were not properly paid for all wages earned and for all
3 wages owed to them by Defendants, including when working more than eight (8) hours in any
4 given day and/or more than forty (40) hours in any given week. As a result of Defendants'
5 unlawful policies and practices, Plaintiff and Class members incurred overtime hours worked for
6 which they were not adequately and completely compensated. To the extent applicable,
7 Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class members at an overtime rate of 1.5 times the
8 regular rate for the first eight hours of the seventh consecutive work day in a week and overtime
9 payments at the rate of 2 times the regular rate for hours worked over eight (8) on the seventh
10 consecutive work day, as required under the Labor Code, applicable IWC Wage Orders.

11 16. Therefore, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
12 continuing to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay
13 Employees for all hours worked and failing to pay minimum wage for all time worked as required
14 by California Law.

15 17. Additionally from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
16 continuing to the present, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay
17 Employees overtime compensation at premium overtime rates for all hours worked in excess of
18 eight (8) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, and double-time rates for all hours worked in
19 excess of twelve (12) hours a day, in violation of Labor Code § 510 and the corresponding
20 sections of IWC Wage Orders.

21 18. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and
22 continuing to the present, Defendants have regularly required Employees to work shifts in excess
23 of five (5) hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty
24 (30) minutes and shifts in excess of ten (10) hours without providing them with second meal
25 periods of not less than thirty minutes; nor did Defendants pay Employees "premium pay," i.e. one
26 hour of wages at each Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that
27 Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided. Furthermore, Defendants had a consistent
28 policy and practice of instructing Employees to record or alter their meal period time records to

1 conform to the schedule, regardless of whether Employees took meal periods that were shorter
2 than thirty minutes, took meal periods after their fifth hour of work, or took no meal period at all.

3 19. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
4 present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with paid rest breaks of not less
5 than ten (10) minutes for every work period of four (4) or more consecutive hours; nor did
6 Defendants pay Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not
7 provided or were deficiently provided at one hour of wages at each Employee's effective regular
8 rate of pay, for each rest period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

9 20. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and
10 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with timely,
11 accurate, and itemized wage statements as required by California wage-and-hour laws.
12 Specifically, the wage statements given to Employees by Defendants failed to accurately account
13 for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficient meal periods and rest breaks all of which
14 Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to Employees, as alleged
15 hereinabove. The wage statements provided to Employees were confusing and required
16 Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was
17 correct, potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Employees.

18 21. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and
19 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Employees with timely,
20 accurate, and itemized wage statements, in writing, as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

21 22. From at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the
22 present, Defendants have failed to reimburse Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the
23 performance of their job duties for Defendants including, but not limited to, the cost of personal
24 cellphone usage, protective gear, work tools such as vacuums and leaf blowers, and mileage when
25 Employees drove personal vehicles while on the job, all of which were necessary to perform their
26 duties under Defendants' employ in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

27 23. Additionally, from at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, and
28 continuing to the present, Defendants have consistently failed to keep accurate time and wage

records as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

24. Additionally, from at least four (4) years prior to filing this lawsuit and continuing to the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages fur and owed to Employees at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

25. In light of the foregoing, Employees bring this action pursuant to, inter alia, Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 245 *et seq.*, 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2 1197, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802.

26. Furthermore, pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-17208, Employees seek injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendants have enjoyed from their violations of Labor Code.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

27. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class defined as follows: all individuals employed by Defendants within the State of California at any time within four (4) years of the filing of this lawsuit.

28. Further, Plaintiff seeks to represent the following Subclasses composed of and defined as follows:

a. Subclass 1. Minimum Wages Subclass. All Class members who were not compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the applicable minimum wage.

b. Subclass 2. Wages and Overtime Subclass. All Class members who were not compensated for all hours worked for Defendants at the required rates of pay, including for all hours worked in excess of eight in a day and/or forty in a week.

c. Subclass 3. Meal Period Subclass. All Class members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to provide unpaid 30-minute uninterrupted and duty-free meal periods or one hour of pay at the Employee's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

d. Subclass 4. Rest Break Subclass. All Class members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to authorize and permit Employees to take

uninterrupted, duty-free, 10-minute rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof, and failing to pay one hour of pay at the Employee's regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

e. Subclass 5. Vacation Wages Subclass. All Class members who were not compensated at the Employee's regular rate of pay for their vacation wages.

f. Subclass 6. Sick Pay Subclass. All Class members who were not compensated at the Employee's regular rate of pay for their sick pay wages.

g. Subclass 7. Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures Subclass. All Class members who were subject to Defendants' failure to reimburse for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of Employees job duties for Defendants.

h. Subclass 8. Wage Statement Subclass. All Class members who, within the applicable limitations period, were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

i. Subclass 9. Payroll Records Subclass. All Class members who were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to keep accurate time and wage records as required by California wage-and-hour laws.

j. Subclass 10. Termination Pay Subclass. All Class members who, within the applicable limitations period, either voluntarily or involuntarily separated from their employment and were subject to Defendants' policy and/or practice of failing to timely pay wages upon termination.

k. Subclass 11. UCL Subclass. All Class members who are owed restitution as a result of Defendants' business acts and practices, to the extent such acts and practices are found to be unlawful, deceptive, and/or unfair.

29. Plaintiff reserves the right under California Rule of Court 3.765 to amend or modify the class description with greater particularity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues.

30. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in litigation and proposed class is easily ascertainable.

///

1 **A. Numerosity**

2 31. The potential members of the class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all
3 the member of the class is impracticable. While the precise number of class members has not been
4 determined at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants employ or, during the
5 time period relevant to this lawsuit, employed more than 100 individuals within the State of
6 California.

7 32. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant time period increases this
8 number substantially. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' employment records will provide
9 information as to the number and location of all class members.

10 **B. Commonality**

11 33. There are questions of law and fact common to the class that predominate over any
12 questions affecting only individual class members. These common questions of law and fact
13 include:

- 14 a. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees minimum wages;
15 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees wages for all hours worked;
16 c. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees overtime as required under Labor
17 Code § 510;
18 d. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the applicable
19 IWC Wage Orders, by failing to provide Employees with requisite meal periods or
20 premium pay in lieu thereof;
21 e. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7, and the applicable IWC Wage
22 Orders, by failing to provide Employees with requisite rest breaks or premium pay
23 in lieu thereof;
24 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees vacation wages as required under
25 Labor Code § 227.3;
26 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay Employees sick pay as required under Labor
27 Code § 245;
28 h. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Employees for necessary business

expenses;

i. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226(a);

j. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5;

k. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by failing to pay wages and compensation due and owing at the time of termination of employment;

l. Whether Defendants are liable for penalties under Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*;

m. Whether Defendants violated Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*; and

n. Whether Employees are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

C. Typicality

34. The claims of the named plaintiff are typical of those of the other Employees.

Employees all sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common course of conduct in violation of statutes, as well as regulations that have the force and effect of law, as alleged herein.

D. Adequacy of Representation

35. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of Employees.

Counsel who represents Employees are experienced and competent in litigating employment class actions.

E. Superiority of Class Action

36. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient

adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Employees is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to all Employees predominate over any questions affecting only individual Employees. Each Employee has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies or practices of failing to compensate Employees properly.

37. Class action treatment will allow those persons similarly situated to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties in managing this case that should preclude class action.

///

1 ///

2 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
3 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**
4 **(Against All Defendants)**

5 38. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
6 full herein.

7 39. Defendants failed to pay Employees minimum wages for all hours worked.
8 Defendants had a consistent policy of misstating Employees time records and failing to pay
9 Employees for all hours worked. Employees would work hours and not receive wages, including
10 as alleged above in connection with working during meal breaks, rounding of timekeeping
11 entries, and working “pre-shift” and “post-shift” without compensation by cleaning and being
12 required to complete assignments before clocking in and after clocking out. Plaintiff and Class
13 members were also not paid for the time that they spent answering work-related phone calls and
14 texts while off-the-clock. Additionally, Defendants had a consistent policy of failing to pay
15 Employees for hours worked during alleged meal periods for which Employees were consistently
16 denied, as also addressed herein. Defendants have also intentionally and improperly rounded,
17 changed, adjusted, and/or modified Employee hours, while benefiting Defendants. Defendants
18 thus regularly failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and Class members, including by
19 unlawful rounding to their detriment. Moreover, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and Employees
20 at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked. Defendants’ uniform pattern of unlawful
21 wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the Class as a whole, as a
22 result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to
23 Plaintiff and the other members of the Class as to minimum wage pay.

24 40. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage”
25 states:

26 The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the
27 minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less
28 wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

1 41. The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the
2 relevant period is found in the Wage Orders. Pursuant to the Wage Orders, Employees are
3 therefore entitled to double the minimum wage during the relevant period.

4 42. The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private
5 civil action pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a) which states:

6 Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any
7 employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal
8 overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to
9 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.

10 43. As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages
11 incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission.

12 44. California Labor Code § 1194.2 also provides for the following remedies:

13 In any action under Section 1194 . . . to recover wages because of
14 the payment of a wage less than the minimum wages fixed by an
15 order of the commission, an employee shall be entitled to recover
liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
unpaid and interest thereon.

16 45. Defendants have the ability to pay minimum wages for all time worked and have
17 willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this
18 indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Employees.

19 46. Wherefore, Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages
20 (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum
21 wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant
22 to California Labor Code § 1194(a).

23 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES AND OVERTIME UNDER LABOR CODE § 510**

25 **(Against All Defendants)**

26 47. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
27 full herein.

28 48. By their conduct, as set forth herein, Defendants violated California Labor Code §

1 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees:
2 (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a
3 workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any workweek or for the first eight (8) hours worked
4 on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours
5 worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any one (1) day or for hours worked in excess of eight
6 (8) hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not
7 paying Employees wages for all hours worked including time off the clock working “pre-shift”
8 and “post-shift” without compensation by cleaning and being required to complete assignments
9 before clocking in and after clocking out. Plaintiff and Class members were also not paid for the
10 time that they spent answering work-related phone calls and texts while off-the-clock. Employees
11 regularly worked over 8 hours on a given day or over 40 hours in a given week without receiving
12 overtime compensation.

13 49. Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and
14 Employees the correct overtime rate for the recorded overtime hours that they generated. In
15 addition to an hourly wage, Defendants paid Plaintiff and Employees nondiscretionary
16 commissions, incentive pay, shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon
17 information and belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including
18 nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary
19 bonuses, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating the overtime
20 wage rate.

21 50. Therefore, during times when Plaintiff and Employees worked overtime and
22 received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary
23 bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all overtime wages by paying a lower overtime rate than
24 required.

25 51. Defendants’ failure to pay compensation in a timely fashion also constituted a
26 violation of California Labor Code § 204, which requires that all wages shall be paid
27 semimonthly. From four (4) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit to the present, in direct
28 violation of that provision of the California Labor Code, Defendants have failed to pay all wages

1 and overtime compensation earned by Employees. Each such failure to make a timely payment of
2 compensation to Employees constitutes a separate violation of California Labor Code § 204.

3 52. Employees have been damaged by these violations of California Labor Code §§
4 204 and 510 (and the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission).

5 53. Consequently, pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 204, 510, and 1194 (and the
6 relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission), Defendants are liable to Employees for
7 the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their
8 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

9 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **MEAL-PERIOD LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 54. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
13 full herein.

14 55. Employees regularly worked shifts greater than five (5) hours and greater than ten
15 (10) hours. Pursuant to Labor Code § 512 an employer may not employ someone for a shift of
16 more than five (5) hours without providing him or her with a meal period of not less than thirty
17 (30) minutes or for a shift of more than ten (10) hours without providing him or her with a second
18 meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

19 56. Defendants failed to provide Employees with meal periods as required under the
20 Labor Code. Employees were consistently required to work through their meal periods which they
21 were consistently denied. Employees were also required to take meal periods after working well
22 beyond the five (5) hour shifts. In addition, Defendants had a consistent policy and practice of
23 instructing Employees to record or alter their meal period time records to conform to the schedule,
24 regardless of whether Employees took meal periods that were shorter than thirty minutes, took
25 meal periods after their fifth hour of work, or took no meal period at all. What meal periods were
26 provided were also not duty-free due to Defendants' policy and practice of interrupting the meal
27 breaks with work demands and requiring Employees to keep phones on during rest breaks to
28 respond to emergencies and other situations. Furthermore, Employees were regularly required to

1 work for more than 10 hours in a given shift without receiving a second uninterrupted thirty (30)
2 minute meal period as required by law.

3 57. Moreover, Defendants failed to compensate Employees for each meal period not
4 provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and
5 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, which provide that, if an employer fails to provide an
6 employee a meal period in accordance with this section, the employer shall pay the employee one
7 hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period
8 is not provided. Defendants failed to compensate the Employees in the Class for each meal period
9 not provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11
10 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order. Additionally, as detailed above, when Defendants did
11 pay meal period premiums, they did so at the normal regular rate of pay without factoring in all
12 forms or remuneration/compensation or by otherwise incorrectly calculating the regular rate.

13 58. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Employees are entitled to damages in
14 an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at their effective hourly rates of pay for each meal
15 period not provided or deficiently provided, a sum to be proven at trial.

16 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **REST-BREAK LIABILITY UNDER LABOR CODE § 226.7**

18 **(Against All Defendants)**

19 59. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
20 full herein.

21 60. Employees consistently worked consecutive four (4) hour shifts. Pursuant to the
22 Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order, Employees were entitled to paid rest breaks of
23 not less than ten (10) minutes for each consecutive four (4) hour shift.

24 61. Defendants failed to provide Employees with timely rest breaks of not less than ten
25 (10) minutes for each consecutive four (4) hour shift. What rest breaks were provided were also
26 not duty-free due to Defendants' policy and practice of interrupting rest breaks with work
27 demands and requiring Employees to keep phones on during rest breaks to respond to emergencies
28 and other situations.

1 62. Moreover, Defendants failed to compensate Employees for each rest period not
2 provided or inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC
3 Wage Orders, which provide that, if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in
4 accordance with this section, the employer shall pay the employee one hour of pay at the
5 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.
6 Defendants failed to compensate the Employees in the Class for each rest period not provided or
7 inadequately provided, as required under Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage
8 Order. Additionally, as detailed above, when Defendants did pay rest period premiums, they did
9 so at the normal regular rate of pay without factoring in all forms or remuneration/compensation
10 or by otherwise incorrectly calculating the regular rate.

11 63. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Employees are entitled to damages in
12 an amount equal to one (1) hour of wages at their effective hourly rates of pay for each day
13 worked without the required rest breaks, a sum to be proven at trial.

14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
15 **FAILURE TO PAY VACATION WAGES**
16 **(Against All Defendants)**

17 64. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
18 full herein.

19 65. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 227.3, whenever a contract of employment or
20 employment policy provides for paid vacation and an employee is terminated without having
21 taken off her vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to her as wages at her final rate
22 in accordance with said contract of employment or policy respecting eligibility or time served.

23 66. Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, shift differentials,
24 and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of
25 remuneration in the regular rate of pay upon which vacation wages were calculated and paid.

26 67. Therefore, Plaintiff and Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor
27 Code § 227.3.

28 ///

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LABOR CODE §§ 245 *ET SEQ.* AND 246**

3 **(Against All Defendants)**

4 68. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
5 full herein.

6 69. California Labor Code § 245 *et seq.* requires that Defendants provide paid sick time
7 to Employees, including at the amount, terms, and rate of compensation set forth in said law. At
8 times relevant, Defendants have failed compute the amount due for paid sick time in conformance
9 with the pay calculation under California Labor Code § 246(1).

10 70. Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, shift differentials,
11 and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of
12 remuneration in the regular rate of pay upon which sick pay was calculated and paid. Rather than
13 calculating the amount of paid sick time due when sick time is used according to the requirements
14 set forth in California Labor Code § 246(1), Defendants paid sick leave to Employees at a lower
15 rate, in violation of the law.

16 71. Therefore, Plaintiff and Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor
17 Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246.

18 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE FOR NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENDITURES**

20 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2802**

21 **(Against All Defendants)**

22 72. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
23 full herein.

24 73. Under Labor Code § 2802(a), an employer must indemnify its employees for all
25 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge
26 of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

27 74. Employees incurred necessary expenditures in the performance of their job duties
28 for Defendants, including but not limited to the cost of cell phone usage, protective gear, work

1 tools such as vacuums and leaf blowers, and mileage when Employees drove personal vehicles
2 while on the job, all of which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ.
3 From four (4) years prior to the original filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the present,
4 Defendants consistently failed to reimburse Employees for these necessarily incurred business
5 expenses.

6 75. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Employees have been deprived of
7 reimbursement in amounts to be determined at trial; they are entitled to recovery of such amounts,
8 plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs.

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
10 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226(a)**
11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 76. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
13 full herein.

14 77. California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each of his or her
15 employees with an accurate, itemized statement in writing showing the gross and net earnings,
16 total hours worked, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate; these
17 statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else
18 serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these
19 statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the
20 employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid.

21 78. Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in
22 writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, the wage statements given to Employees, by
23 Defendants, failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficient meal
24 periods and rest breaks, and reflected incorrect hours worked all of which Defendants knew or
25 reasonably should have known were owed to Employees, as alleged hereinabove. Additionally,
26 Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records of the correct overtime
27 wages based on proper regular rate calculations that included nondiscretionary commissions,
28 incentive pay, shift differentials, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses earned, and the total amount of

1 compensation of their Employees. The wage statements provided to Employees were confusing
2 and required Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their
3 pay was correct, potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Employees.

4 79. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a),
5 Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received
6 all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and
7 forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact
8 compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

9 80. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e), Employees are entitled to recover
10 the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation
11 occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not
12 exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an
13 award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

14 81. With respect to violations of Labor Code § 226, Labor Code § 226.3 imposes a
15 civil penalty of two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for initial violations for each employee for
16 each pay period, and one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each subsequent violation for each
17 employee for each pay period.

18 82. Plaintiff is seeking penalties against Defendants under Labor Code § 226.3, and
19 any other applicable statute allowing recovery of penalties as alleged herein in an amount to be
20 shown according to proof.

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO KEEP REQUIRED PAYROLL RECORDS UNDER LABOR CODE § 1174**

23 **AND 1174.5**

24 **(Against All Defendants)**

25 83. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
26 full herein.

27 84. California Labor Code § 1174 requires that all employers shall keep accurate time
28 and wage records for all employees. California Labor Code § 1174.5 further requires that any

1 employee suffering injury due to a willful violation of the aforementioned obligations may seek
2 damages, including civil penalties, from the employer.

3 85. During the course of Plaintiff's and Employees' employment, Defendants
4 consistently failed to maintain accurate time and wage records for Plaintiff and Employees as
5 required by California Labor Code § 1174 by failing to pay Plaintiff and Employees proper wages,
6 overtime, and premium pay as discussed above.

7 86. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for civil penalties pursuant to the California
8 Labor Code § 1174.5. for the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

9 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
10 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 203**
11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 87. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
13 full herein.

14 88. Numerous Employees are no longer employed by Defendants; they either quit
15 Defendants' employ or were fired therefrom.

16 89. Defendants failed to pay these Employees all wages due and certain at the time of
17 termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation.

18 90. The wages withheld from these Employees by Defendants remained due and owing
19 for more than thirty (30) days from the date of separation of employment.

20 91. Defendants' failure to pay wages, as alleged above, was willful in that Defendants
21 knew wages to be due but failed to pay them; this violation entitles these Employees to penalties
22 under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up
23 to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

24 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
25 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 *ET SEQ.***
26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 92. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
28 full herein.

1 93. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, Employees, and the general public, brings this claim
2 pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* The conduct of Defendants as alleged in
3 this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Employees and the
4 general public. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the
5 meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

6 94. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code
7 § 17204, has suffered injury, and therefore has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive
8 relief, restitution, and other appropriate equitable relief.

9 95. Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* prohibits unlawful and unfair
10 business practices.

11 96. Wage-and-hour laws express fundamental public policies. Paying employees their
12 wages and overtime, providing them with meal and rest periods, etc., are fundamental public
13 policies of California. Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of this State vigorously
14 to enforce minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to
15 work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding employers and their
16 employees from competitors who lower costs to themselves by failing to comply with minimum
17 labor standards.

18 97. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct alleged
19 in this Complaint, Defendants have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated specific
20 provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business practices in
21 violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* Defendants’ conduct has deprived
22 Plaintiff, and all persons similarly situated, and all interested persons, of the rights, benefits, and
23 privileges guaranteed to all employees under the law.

24 98. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged hereinabove, constitutes unfair competition in
25 violation of the Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

26 99. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, by failing to pay wages and
27 overtime, failing to provide meal and rest periods, etc., either knew or in the exercise of reasonable
28 care should have known that their conduct was unlawful; therefore their conduct violates the

1 Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

2 100. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Employees have
3 been damaged, in a sum to be proven at trial.

4 101. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to engage in such
5 unlawful conduct as alleged above. Pursuant to the Business & Professions Code, this Court
6 should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be
7 necessary to prevent the use by Defendants or their agents or employees of any unlawful or
8 deceptive practice prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, including but not limited to the
9 disgorgement of such profits as may be necessary to restore Employees to the money Defendants
10 have unlawfully failed to pay.

11 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699, *ET SEQ.***

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 102. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs, as though set forth in
15 full herein.

16 103. Plaintiff and Employees are aggrieved employees as defined under Labor Code §
17 2699(c) in that they suffered the violations alleged in this Complaint and were employed by the
18 alleged violators, Defendants.

19 104. Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants'
20 violation of all Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5 and includes the
21 penalty provisions, without limitation, based on the following California Labor Code sections:
22 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 245 *et seq.*, 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174,
23 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2 1197, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802.

24 105. The penalties shall be allocated as follows: 65% to the Labor and Workforce
25 Development Agency (LWDA) and 35% to the affected employee.

26 106. Employees also seek any and all penalties and remedies set forth in Labor Code §
27 558, which states:

28 107. Labor Code § 226.3 provides that “[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a) of

1 Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
2 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee
3 for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a
4 wage deduction statement or fails to keep the required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.” To the
5 extent that Labor Code § 226.3 applies, Plaintiff and Employees also seeks such penalties on.

6 108. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedy by sending a certified letter to the
7 LWDA and Defendants postmarked November 4, 2024. The LWDA has not provided notice of its
8 intent to investigate the alleged violations withing 65 calendar days of the postmark date of the
9 letters.

10 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

11 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 12 1. For an order certifying this action as a class action;
- 13 2. For compensatory damages in the amount of the unpaid minimum wages for work
14 performed by Employees and unpaid overtime compensation from at least four (4) years prior to
15 the filing of this action, as may be proven;
- 16 3. For liquidated damages in the amount equal to the unpaid minimum wage and
17 interest thereon, from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, according to proof;
- 18 4. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Employees
19 for each missed or deficient meal period where no premium pay was paid therefor from four (4)
20 years prior to the filing of this action, as may be proven;
- 21 5. For compensatory damages in the amount of the hourly wage made by Employees
22 for each day requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided and where no
23 premium pay was paid therefor from at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action, as may
24 be proven;
- 25 6. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) for Employees, as may be proven;
- 26 7. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3, as may be proven;
- 27 8. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3, as may be proven;
- 28 9. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 245 and 246, as may be proven;

10. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for all Employees who quit or were fired in an amount equal to their daily wage times thirty (30) days, as may be proven;

11. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, as may be proven;

12. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, including disgorgement or profits, as may be proven;

13. For compensatory damages in the amount of all previously unreimbursed business expenditures necessarily incurred by Employees in the discharge of their job duties for Defendants from four (4) years prior to the original filing of this action, as may be proven;

14. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, as may be proven;

15. For an order enjoining Defendants and their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them, from acting in derogation of any rights or duties adumbrated in this Complaint;

16. For all general, special, and incidental damages as may be proven;

17. For an award of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

18. For an award providing for the payment of the costs of this suit;

19. For an award of attorneys' fees; and

20. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper and just.

DATED: January 8, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

By 

David Yeremian
Roman Shkodnik
Mason Doidge
Attorneys for Plaintiff
BRUNO CRUZ
and the putative class

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands trial of his claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

DATED: January 8, 2025

D.LAW, INC.

By 

David Yerehman
Roman Shkodnik
Mason Doidge
Attorneys for Plaintiff
BRUNO CRUZ
and the putative class

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

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

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Nicole L. Antonopoulos, Bar No. 306882
1400 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Tel: +1.650.843.4000
Fax: +1.650.843.4001
nicole.antonopoulos@morganlewis.com

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

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


Kathryn Perez