

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com

Electronically Filed
8/29/2023 2:46 PM
Superior Court of California
County of Stanislaus
Clerk of the Court
By: Raquel Enriquez, Deputy

JCL LAW FIRM, APC
Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff PORSCHE BARRETT and LAELAH GROSS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF STANISLAUS

PORSCHE BARRETT and LAELAH GROSS,
individuals, on behalf of themselves, and on
behalf of all other aggrieved employees,

PLAINTIFFS,

vs.

ARMADILLO HOLDINGS, LLC dba TEXAS
ROADHOUSE, a Nevada Limited Liability
Company; and Does 1 through 50, Inclusive,

DEFENDANTS.

Case No.: CV-22-003127

**FIRST AMENDED
REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. VIOLATIONS OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT AT
LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698, et
seq.

1 Plaintiffs PORSCHE BARRETT and LAELAH GROSS (“PLAINTIFFS”) on behalf of
2 the people of the State of California and as “aggrieved employees” acting as a private attorney
3 general under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Action of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.*
4 (“PAGA”) only, alleges on information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which
5 are based on personal knowledge, the following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFFS bring this action against ARMADILLO HOLDINGS, LLC dba
8 TEXAS ROADHOUSE (“DEFENDANT” or “DEFENDANTS”) seeking only to recover PAGA
9 civil penalties for themselves, and on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that
10 worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFFS does **not seek to recover anything other than**
11 **penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.** To the extent that statutory
12 violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFFS does not seek underlying general
13 and/or special damages for those violations in this action, but simply the civil penalties permitted
14 by California Labor Code § 2699. Notwithstanding, PLAINTIFFS is not abandoning their right
15 to pursue their individual claims for, *inter alia*, DEFENDANT’s alleged wage violations, and/or
16 general or special damages arising from those violations, and she fully intends to, at a future
17 date, pursue claims for those individual claims and damages.

18 2. California has enacted the PAGA to permit an individual to bring an action on
19 behalf of themselves and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and
20 sole nature of this action.

21 3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFFS seek to obtain all applicable relief for
22 DEFENDANT’s violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA – that
23 is, penalties and any other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to the PAGA. Nothing in this
24 complaint should be construed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in a
25 PAGA-only action.

26
27
28 ///

THE PARTIES

4. DEFENDANT is a Nevada limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the State of California, County of Stanislaus.

5. DEFENDANT owns, operates and/or manages a chain of Texas Roadhouse restaurants in the state of California, including in Stanislaus County where PLAINTIFF worked.

6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFFS who therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFFS is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that the Defendant named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (hereinafter collectively "DEFENDANTS"), are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

7. The agents, servants and/or employees of the DEFENDANTS and each of them acting on behalf of the DEFENDANTS acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the DEFENDANTS, and personally participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the DEFENDANTS with respect to the conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each of the DEFENDANTS are legally attributable to the other and all DEFENDANTS are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFFS and those similarly situated, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the DEFENDANTS' agents, servants and/or employees.

8. DEFENDANT was PLAINTIFFS' employers or persons acting on behalf of PLAINTIFFS' employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as

1 such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code §
2 558, at all relevant times.

3 9. DEFENDANT was PLAINTIFFS' employers or persons acting on behalf of
4 PLAINTIFFS' employer either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another
5 person, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 1197.1, who paid or caused to be paid to
6 any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by California state law, and as such, are
7 subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee.

8 10. Plaintiff Porsche Barrett has been employed by DEFENDANT in California since
9 2015 and at all times was classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an
10 hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum
11 and overtime wages dur for all time worked.

12 11. Plaintiff Laelah Gross was employed by DEFENDANT in California from
13 August 11, 2022, to October 23, 2023, and at all times was classified by DEFENDANT as a non-
14 exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest
15 periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages dur for all time worked.

16 12. PLAINTIFFS, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
17 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
18 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to
19 themselves and all non-exempt employees, exempt employees and individuals classified as
20 independent contractors who worked for DEFENDANT in California (the "AGGRIEVED
21 EMPLOYEES") during the time period of May 4, 2021 until the present (the "PAGA
22 PERIOD").

23 13. PLAINTIFFS, on behalf of themselves and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
24 presently or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this
25 representative action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* seeking penalties for
26 DEFENDANTS' violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5,
27 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
28 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, & 2804 and the applicable Wage Order. Based upon the

1 foregoing, PLAINTIFFS and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees within
2 the meaning of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 14. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
5 Procedure, Section 410.10.

6 15. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
7 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times
8 maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this
9 County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against
10 PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

11 **THE CONDUCT**

12 16. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
13 required to pay PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked,
14 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
15 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFFS
16 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they are under
17 DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFFS to work
18 while clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break.
19 PLAINTIFFS are from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what
20 should be PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established
21 company policy and procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time
22 worked and recorded by PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit
23 of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFFS and
24 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid
25 for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other
26 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-
27 duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly recorded and without
28 compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay

1 PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by
2 DEFENDANT's business records.

3 **A. Meal Period Violation**

4 17. In California, an employer may not employ an employee for a work period of
5 more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a duty-free meal period of
6 not less than thirty minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no
7 more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and
8 employee. A second duty-free meal period of not less than thirty minutes is required if an
9 employee works more than ten hours per day, except that if the total hours worked is no more
10 than 12 hours, the second duty-free meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the
11 employer and employee only if the first meal period was not waived. Labor Code Section 512.

12 18. If an employer fails to provide an employee a duty-free meal period in accordance
13 with an applicable IWC Order, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the
14 employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that the meal period is not provided. IWC
15 Orders and Labor Code Section 226.7. This additional hour is not counted as hours worked for
16 purposes of overtime calculations.

17 19. From time-to-time during the PAGA PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
18 schedules, PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were unable to take thirty (30)
19 minute off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods.
20 PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to
21 perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts
22 without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide
23 PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some
24 workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of
25 work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid
26 paying penalties to PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFFS and
27 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional
28 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

1 **B. Rest Period Violations**

2 20. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires that employers must authorize and
3 permit nonexempt employees to take a rest period that must, insofar as practicable, be taken in
4 the middle of each work period. The rest period is based on the total hours worked daily and
5 must be at the minimum rate of a net ten consecutive minutes for each four-hour work period, or
6 major fraction thereof. The Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (DLSE) considers
7 anything more than two hours to be a “major fraction” of four. A rest period is not required for
8 employees whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half hours. The rest period is
9 counted as time worked and therefore, the employer must pay for such periods.

10 21. If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with an
11 applicable IWC Order, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the
12 employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday that the rest period is not provided. Labor Code
13 Section 226.7. Thus, if an employer does not provide all of the rest periods required in a workday,
14 the employee is entitled to one additional hour of pay for that workday, not one additional hour
15 of pay for each rest period that was not provided during that workday.

16 22. From time-to-time during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and other
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
18 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest
19 periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours
20 from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts
21 worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third
22 rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
23 time to time. PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with
24 one-hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires
25 employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court
26 defined as time during which an employee is relieved from all work-related duties and free from
27 employer control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that
28 employers authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must

1 relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time
2 which includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers
3 cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out,
4 five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFFS and other
5 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on
6 DEFENDANT's rule which states PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES cannot
7 leave the work premises during their rest period

8 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

9 23. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
10 PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred
11 by the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of discharging
12 their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers
13 are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their
14 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or
15 her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
16 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
17 the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions,
18 believed them to be unlawful."

19 24. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED
20 EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal
21 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
22 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated
23 with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically,
24 PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by DEFENDANT to use
25 their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with
26 DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed
27 business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their
28 personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

1 25. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFFS, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
2 required off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS as required by the applicable Wage Order
3 and Labor Code and failed to pay PLAINTIFFS all minimum and overtime wages due to
4 PLAINTIFFS. DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which provided timely off-duty
5 meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS and also failed to compensate PLAINTIFFS for
6 PLAINTIFFS' missed meal and rest breaks. The nature of the work performed by the
7 PLAINTIFFS did not prevent PLAINTIFFS from being relieved of all of PLAINTIFFS' duties
8 for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide
9 PLAINTIFFS with the legally required meal periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
10 records.

11 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

12 26. California Labor Code Section 226 requires an employer to furnish its employees
13 an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
14 worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all
15 deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is
16 paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security
17 number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name
18 and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect
19 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
20 employee.

21 27. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the
22 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to
23 show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides
24 that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage
25 statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly
26 rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly
27 rate. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Labor Code 226(a)(8) by failing to list the correct legal entity
28 that employed Plaintiff and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Further, from time to time,

1 DEFENDANTS included Holiday hours into the computation of total hours worked for purposes
2 of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2), notwithstanding the fact that Holiday hours are not considered
3 hours worked. DEFENDANTS' inclusion of Holiday hours into the total hours worked in
4 itemized wage statements issued to PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
5 violates Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph,
6 DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the
7 requirements under California Labor Code 226 et seq. As a result, DEFENDANT from time to
8 time provided PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements
9 which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

10 **E. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

11 28. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
12 continue to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all
13 hours worked.

14 29. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
15 PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work,
16 including but not limited to, undergoing pre-shift Covid-19 health screenings from time to time
17 off-the-clock. This resulted in PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to have to work
18 while off-the-clock.

19 30. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the uncompensated off-the-
20 clock work performed by PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

21 31. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, protocols, applications,
22 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

23 32. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFFS and
24 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to document,
25 track, or pay PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages earned and owed for all
26 the work they performed.

27 33. PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were non-exempt employees,
28 subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

1 34. DEFENDANT's policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFFS and
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all minimum, regular, overtime, and double time wages owed
3 for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
4 typically worked over 40 hours in a workweek, and more than eight (8) hours per day,
5 DEFENDANT's policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

6 35. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and
7 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

8 36. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due
9 them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control and benefit for the time spent
10 working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to not pay
11 PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' wages for all hours worked in accordance with
12 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

13 **F. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**
14 **and Sick Pay**

15 37. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half
16 times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were
17 compensated at an hourly rate plus a piece-rate, and/or non-discretionary incentive pay that was
18 tied to specific elements of an employee's performance and/or commissions.

19 38. DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary commission and bonus program provided the
20 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, including PLAINTIFFS, with commissions and/or bonus
21 compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by DEFENDANT.
22 However, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay periods where PLAINTIFFS and
23 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked overtime and earned non-discretionary bonus and/or
24 commission wages, DEFENDANT failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
25 compensation and/or commission wages as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay."

26 39. Management and supervisors described the bonus and commissions programs and
27 commission compensation program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation
28 package for new and used car salespersons including PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES. As a matter of law, the incentive and commission compensation received by
2 PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be included and correctly calculated
3 into the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of overtime compensation and sick pay.
4 DEFENDANT’s failure to do so has resulted in DEFENDANT’s systematic underpayment of
5 overtime compensation and sick pay to PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.
6 Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time for non-employees
7 shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the
8 employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that
9 workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive
10 compensation as part of the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of sick pay compensation was in
11 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is recoverable under Cal. Labor
12 Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

13 40. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
14 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a
15 matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
16 compensate PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct rate of pay
17 for all overtime, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay. This uniform policy and practice
18 of DEFENDANTS is intended to purposefully avoid the payment of the correct overtime and,
19 meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay as required by California law which allowed
20 DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied
21 with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED
22 EMPLOYEES members against DEFENDANTS, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted
23 accordingly.

24 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

25 41. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, “It shall be unlawful for any employer
26 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to
27 said employee.” DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFFS and other
28 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, made unlawful deductions from compensation payable to

1 PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, failed to disclose all aspects of the deductions
2 from compensation payable to PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and thereby
3 failed to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable pay period and upon termination.
4 PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES seek recovery of all illegal deductions from
5 wages according to proof, related penalties, interest, attorney fees and costs

6 **H. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

7 42. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFFS and the
8 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
9 employment. PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time, did not
10 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
11 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.
12 Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

13 [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty
14 provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as
15 provided in Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For
16 any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee;
17 (2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred
18 dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount
19 unlawfully withheld.

20 43. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to timely pay PLAINTIFFS and
21 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the close of the payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab.
22 Code § 204, including but not limited to the “Retro Pay Flat” wage payment.

23 44. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFFS
24 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time
25 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFFS are informed and
26 believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful,
27 such that PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose employment has separated are
28 entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

1 **I. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

2 45. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT did not have in place an immutable
3 timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED
4 EMPLOYEES for the actual time these employees worked each day, including overtime hours.
5 Specifically, DEFENDANT had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice that resulted
6 in PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES being undercompensated for all of their time
7 worked. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round
8 the time recorded in DEFENDANT’S timekeeping system for PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED
9 EMPLOYEES in order to avoid paying these employees for all their time worked, including the
10 applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and
11 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked
12 by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the
13 applicable overtime rates.

14 46. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT’S timekeeping system and unlawful
15 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ time
16 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding
17 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work as
18 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
19 duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding policy and practice caused
20 PLAINTIFFS and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
21 for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty meal break.

22 **J. Failure to Provide Personnel Files**

23 47. On March 11, 2022, Plaintiff Barrett caused a written request via certified mail
24 to be believed to DEFENDANTS for Plaintiff Barrett’s personnel and employment records,
25 including but not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay
26 stubs; and (4) Plaintiff Barrett’s complete employment file.

27 48. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to Plaintiff Barrett her
28 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within

thirty (30) days of her request stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint, DEFENDANTS have still failed to pay Plaintiff Barrett the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750. DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5 by failing to respond and provide Plaintiff Barrett with her employment file. Section 1198.5 states that employees (and former employees) have the right to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer “related to the employee’s performance or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must allow inspection or copying within thirty (30) days of the request. Plaintiff Barrett is now entitled to and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance with Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5, a statutory penalty, and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs for bringing this action.

49. Specifically, as to Plaintiff Barrett, Plaintiff Barrett was from time to time unable to take off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods. Plaintiff Barrett was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide Plaintiff Barrett with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided Plaintiff Barrett with a rest break, they required Plaintiff Barrett to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break. DEFENDANTS policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. Plaintiff Barrett therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT strict corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided Plaintiff Barrett with a paystub that failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT also failed to reimburse Plaintiff Barrett for required business expenses related to the use of her personal cell phone, on behalf of and in furtherance of her employment with DEFENDANT. Further, failed to provide and/or make available to Plaintiff Barrett her personnel records, payroll records, employment contracts, and entire employment file within (30) days of all her request on March 11, 2022. To date, DEFENDANT have not fully paid Plaintiff Barrett the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for Plaintiff Barrett individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 et seq.]**

4 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF against all Defendants)**

5 50. PLAINTIFFS reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth
6 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

7 51. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
8 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who does so as the proxy or agent of
9 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is
10 fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private
11 parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means
12 of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting
13 PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow
14 aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor
15 Code violations ..." (Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1).

16 52. PLAINTIFFS, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
17 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
18 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to
19 themselves and all non-exempt, exempt, commission-based and/or piece-rate based employees
20 who worked for DEFENDANT in California during the time period of May 4, 2021 until the
21 present (the "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES")

22 53. On May 4, 2022, PLAINTIFFS gave written notice by certified mail to the Labor
23 and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the specific
24 provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See
25 Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting
26 period for PLAINTIFFS to add these allegations to the Complaint have expired. As a result,
27 pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFFS may now commence a representative civil action
28 under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all

1 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

2 54. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
3 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and other
4 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES minimum wages and overtime wages, (b) failed to provide
5 PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES legally required meal and rest breaks, (c)
6 failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct regular rate of
7 pay, (d) failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time
8 worked, and (e) failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, all in violation of the
9 applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §2699.5, including but not limited to Labor
10 Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510,
11 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1998.5 1199, 2802, and 2804,
12 and the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to statutory penalties as a
13 result of such conduct. PLAINTIFFS hereby seek recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the
14 Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California
15 for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

16 55. Some or all of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the
17 PAGA PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not
18 affect PLAINTIFFS during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS seek penalties for those
19 violations that affected other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. (*Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*
20 (2018) 30 Cal.App.5th 504, 519; See also *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018)
21 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 [“PAGA allows an “aggrieved employee”—a person affected by at
22 least one Labor Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor
23 Code violations committed by that employer.”], Emphasis added, reh'g denied (June 13, 2018).)

24
25
26
27
28 ///

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS pray for judgment against DEFENDANT as follows:

(a) For reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit to the extent permitted by law, including pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*;

(b) For civil penalties to the extent permitted by law pursuant to the Labor Code under the Private Attorneys General Act; and

For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: August 29, 2022

JCL LAW FIRM, APC



Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFFS

EXHIBIT 1



5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Tel: 619-599-8292
Fax: 619-599-8291
Toll Free: 1-888-498-6999
www.jcl-lawfirm.com

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

Eduardo Garcia, Esq.
egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com

May 4, 2022

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendants
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

ARMADILLO HOLDINGS, LLC dba TEXAS ROADHOUSE
c/o Northwest Registered Agent, Inc.
2108 N St., Ste. N
Sacramento, CA 95816-5712

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 7021 2720 0000 9972 6860

TEXAS ROADHOUSE MANAGEMENT CORP.
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr., Ste. 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

TEXAS ROADHOUSE, INC.
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr., Ste. 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 7021 2720 0000 9972 6877

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Our offices represent Plaintiff PORSCHE BARRETT (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant ARMADILLO HOLDINGS, LLC dba TEXAS ROADHOUSE (“Defendant Armadillo Holdings”), Defendant TEXAS ROADHOUSE MANAGEMENT CORP. (“Defendant Texas Roadhouse Management”), and Defendant TEXAS ROADHOUSE, INC. (“Defendant Texas Roadhouse”) (collectively, “Defendants”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendants in California since 2015 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to payment of all wages and the legally required meal and rest breaks and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendants, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all of their time

worked, and for all of their meal breaks and rest breaks. Further, Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for earned wages.

As a consequence of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff further contends that Defendants failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other aggrieved employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, violates the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as all non-exempt and exempt employees who worked for Defendant Armadillo Holdings and/or Defendant Texas Roadhouse Management and/or Defendant Texas Roadhouse in California during the relevant claim period.

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendants, which (1) identifies the alleged violations, (2) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (3) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (4) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (5) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendants, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

To the extent that entities and/or individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code Sections including, but not limited to 558, 558.1, and 1197.1—Plaintiff reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue.

Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this notice. Consequently, Defendants is on notice that Plaintiff continues her investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendants as authorized by California Labor Code section 2695, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other aggrieved employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees.

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Very truly yours,
JCL LAW FIRM, APC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jean-Claude Lapuyade', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.

Enclosure (1)

EXHIBIT

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
julieann@zakaylaw.com

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Eduardo Garcia (State Bar #290572)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
egarcia@jcl-lawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF STANISLAUS**

PORSCHE BARRETT, an individual, on behalf
of herself and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARMADILLO HOLDINGS, LLC dba TEXAS
ROADHOUSE, a Nevada Limited Liability
Company; TEXAS ROADHOUSE
MANAGEMENT CORP., a Kentucky
Corporation; TEXAS ROADHOUSE, INC., a
Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 *et seq*;
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
- 3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 510 *et seq*;
- 4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
- 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN

DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN
VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR
CODE §2802.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff PORSCHE BARRETT (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

THE PARTIES

1. Defendant ARMADILLO HOLDINGS, LLC dba TEXAS ROADHOUSE (“Defendant Armadillo Holdings”) is a Nevada limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California.

2. Defendant TEXAS ROADHOUSE MANAGEMENT CORP. (“Defendant Texas Roadhouse Management”) is a Kentucky corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California.

3. Defendant TEXAS ROADHOUSE, INC. (“Defendant Texas Roadhouse”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business in the state of California.

4. Defendant Armadillo Holdings, Defendant Texas Roadhouse Management and Defendant Texas Roadhouse were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the contracts signed and by the company the PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively, and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein and collectively referred to herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

5. DEFENDANT owns, operates and/or manages a chain of Texas Roadhouse restaurants in the state of California, including in Stanislaus County where PLAINTIFF worked.

6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANT DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANT by such fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this

1 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are
2 ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
3 alleges, that the DEFENDANT named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,
4 inclusive, (hereinafter collectively “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT”) are responsible
5 in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries
6 and damages hereinafter alleged.

7 7. The agents, servants, and/or employees of the DEFENDANT and each of them
8 acting on behalf of the DEFENDANT acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority
9 as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendant, and personally participated in the conduct
10 alleged herein on behalf of the DEFENDANT with respect to the conduct alleged herein.
11 Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other DEFENDANT and
12 all DEFENDANT are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the
14 Defendant’s agents, servants and/or employees.

15 8. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF’s employers or persons acting on behalf of
16 PLAINTIFF’s employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or
17 caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision
18 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as
19 such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558,
20 at all relevant times.

21 9. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF’s employers or persons acting on behalf of
22 PLAINTIFF’s employer either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person,
23 within the meaning of California Labor Code § 1197.1, who paid or caused to be paid to any
24 employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by California state law, and as such, are subject to
25 civil penalties for each underpaid employee.

26 10. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT in California since 2015 and at
27 all times was classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis,
28 and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime
wages due for all time worked.

1 11. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
2 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Armadillo Holdings
3 and/or Defendant Texas Roadhouse Management and/or Defendant Texas Roadhouse in
4 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time
5 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
6 date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the
7 aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
8 (\$5,000,000.00).

9 12. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during
11 the CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice which failed to
12 lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice alleged
13 herein was an unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANT retained
14 and continues to retain wages due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
15 CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
16 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the
17 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by
18 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
19 relief.

20 13. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
21 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to retain
22 wages due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

23 14. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an
24 injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named
25 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically
26 injured by DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and
27 equitable relief.

28 ///

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

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

1 accordingly.

2 **A. Meal Period Violations**

3 18. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
4 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
5 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
6 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time-to-time during the CLASS
7 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work
8 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically, as a
9 result of PLAINTIFF's demanding work requirements and DEFENDANT'S understaffing,
10 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work during what was supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-
11 duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not even receive a partial
12 lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited
13 minimum wage and overtime wages by regularly working without their time being accurately
14 recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates.
15 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
16 CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

17 19. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
18 requirements and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-
20 duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and
21 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as
22 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a
23 meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which
25 these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to
26 time. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
27 Members does not qualify for limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception.
28 When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS

Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

B. Rest Period Violations

20. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses

21. DEFENDANT as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS for required business expenses incurred by the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though

1 unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be
2 unlawful."

3 22. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to use their personal cell phones as a result of and in furtherance
5 of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANT. But for the use of their own personal cell
6 phones, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members could not complete their essential
7 job duties. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their use of their personal cell phones. As a result, in the
9 course of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses, but were not limited to, costs related
11 to the use of their personal cellular phones, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

12 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

13 23. California Labor Code Section 226 requires an employer to furnish its employees
14 an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked,
15 (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions, (5) net
16 wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name
17 of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security number or an
18 employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of
19 the legal entity that is the employer and, (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
20 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

21 24. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed
23 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also failed
24 to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate
25 wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the total hours worked and all
26 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
27 worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest
28 periods.

1 25. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
2 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
3 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

4 26. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,
6 DEFENDANT's violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated or due to an
7 unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

8 **E. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

9 27. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
10 continue to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
11 CLASS for all hours worked.

12 28. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
13 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
14 work, including but not limited to, undergoing pre-shift Covid-19 health screenings from time to
15 time off-the-clock. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
16 to have to work while off-the-clock.

17 29. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the uncompensated off-the-
18 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

19 30. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, protocols, applications,
20 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

22 31. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
23 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
24 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
25 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

26 32. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-
27 exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.
28

1 33. DEFENDANT's policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
2 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS of all minimum, regular, overtime, and double time wages
3 owed for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over 40 hours in a workweek, and more than eight (8)
5 hours per day, DEFENDANT's policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

6 34. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
7 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

8 35. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
9 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control and benefit
10 for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to
11 not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked
12 in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

13 **F. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums, and**
14 **Sick Pay**

15 36. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
16 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
18 sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS members forfeited wages
19 due them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time
20 rates, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and
21 practice to not pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS members the correct rate for all overtime and
22 double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay in accordance with applicable
23 law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

24 37. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
25 their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members were
26 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
27 employee's performance.
28

1 38. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid
3 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for
4 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
5 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
6 DEFENDANTS.

7 39. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay
8 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double
9 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or paid sick pay, and earned non-
10 discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
11 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
12 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
13 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
14 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
15 CLASS members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted
16 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
17 premiums, and sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members by
18 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time
19 for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
20 workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee
21 actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as articulated herein, by
22 failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of
23 sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is
24 recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

25 40. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
26 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
27 matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
28 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate

1 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay.
2 This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment
3 of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
4 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an
5 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
6 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANT, the
7 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

8 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

9 41. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
10 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do
11 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
12 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

13 **H. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

14 42. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
16 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
17 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
18 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

19 **I. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

20 43. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT did not have in place
21 an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including
23 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANT had in place an unlawful rounding policy and
24 practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
25 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in
26 fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system
27 for PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these
28 employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime

1 worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from time to time,
2 forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately
3 recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

4 44. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT’S timekeeping system and unlawful
5 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ time
6 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding
7 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
8 as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
9 duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANT’S unlawful rounding policy and practice caused
10 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
11 for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty meal break.

12 **J. Failure to Provide Personnel Files**

13 45. On March 11, 2022, PLAINTIFF caused a written request via certified mail to be
14 believed to DEFENDANTS for PLAINTIFF’S personnel and employment records, including but
15 not limited to: (1) payroll records; (2) employment contracts; (3) itemized pay stubs; and (4)
16 PLAINTIFF’S complete employment file.

17 46. DEFENDANTS failed to provide and/or make available to PLAINTIFF her
18 personnel records, payroll records, employment contract, and entire employment file within thirty
19 (30) days of her request stated above. In fact, as of the date of filing of this complaint,
20 DEFENDANTS have still failed to pay PLAINTIFF the statutory penalty in the amount of \$750.
21 DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5 by failing to respond and provide
22 PLAINTIFF with her employment file. Section 1198.5 states that employees (and former
23 employees) have the right to inspect personnel records maintained by the employer “related to
24 the employee’s performance or to any grievance concerning the employee.” Employers must
25 allow inspection or copying within thirty (30) days of the request. PLAINTIFF is now entitled to
26 and requests injunctive relief to obtain compliance with Cal. Lab. Code Section 1198.5, a statutory
27 penalty, and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs for bringing this action

28 47. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods.

1 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)
2 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
3 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required
4 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF
5 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
6 DEFENDANTS policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
7 supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
8 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT strict corporate policy
9 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with a paystub that failed to
10 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT also failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF
11 for required business expenses related to the use of her personal cell phone, on behalf of and in
12 furtherance of her employment with DEFENDANT. Further, failed to provide and/or make
13 available to PLAINTIFF her personnel records, payroll records, employment contracts, and entire
14 employment file within (30) days of all her request on March 11, 2022. To date, DEFENDANT
15 have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed
16 to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy
17 for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

17 **K. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18 58. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
19 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Armadillo Holdings
20 and/or Defendant Texas Roadhouse Management and/or Defendant Texas Roadhouse in
21 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time
22 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
23 date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

24 59. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have uniformly been
25 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to
26 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,
27 illegal meal and rest period policies, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failed compensate
28

1 for off-the-clock work, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to maintain
2 required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and expenses.

3 60. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
4 impractical.

5 61. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANT's conduct, including
6 but not limited to, the off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to
7 accurately calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately
8 calculate the regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failing to
9 provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failure
10 to provide accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid at least
11 minimum wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any
12 questions affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and
13 fact common to the class are:

- 14 a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
15 practices;
 - 16 b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
17 practices;
 - 18 c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
 - 20 d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 Members accurate overtime wages;
 - 22 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
 - 24 f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS Members for required business expenses;
 - 26 g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 27
28

- 1 h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
2 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS for all time worked;
- 4 i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
5 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit
7 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
8 permit this work;
- 9 j. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the
10 UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

12 62. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
13 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

14 63. PLAINTIFF's claims are typical of the claims of the class, and PLAINTIFF has
15 the same interests as the other members of the class.

16 64. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

18 65. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
19 litigation.

20 66. Further, PLAINTIFF's interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
21 interests of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

22 67. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of
23 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are
24 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
25 sustained.

26 68. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
27 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual
28 issues relating to liability and damages.

69. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all class members is impractical. Moreover, since the damages suffered by individual members of the class may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation makes it practically impossible for the members of the class individually to redress the wrongs done to them. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will create the risk of:

- a. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
- b. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impeded their ability to protect their interests.

Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Business Practices

(Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

70. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

71. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code § 17021.

1 72. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) defines
2 unfair competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section 17203
3 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair competition
4 as follows:

5 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition
6 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such
7 orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary
8 to prevent the use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes
9 unfair competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to
any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have
been acquired by means of such unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §
17203).

10 73. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
11 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
12 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
13 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
14 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.
15 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
16 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

17 74. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were unlawful and unfair
18 in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive unscrupulous
19 or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility for which
20 this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the California
21 Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

22 75. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were deceptive and
23 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
24 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and
25 rest periods and, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the
26 applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal.
27 Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief,
28 pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

1 76. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
2 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
3 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
4 DEFENDANT.

5 77. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
6 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
7 legally required meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members
8 as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

9 78. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of herself and on behalf of each
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal
11 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for
12 each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10)
13 hours of work.

14 79. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of herself and on behalf of each
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was
16 not timely provided as required by law.

17 80. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
18 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and
20 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
21 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
22 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

23 81. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial
24 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor
25 Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive, and
26 unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair and deceptive business
27 practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

28

1 82. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,
2 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
3 DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
5 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

6 83. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
7 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair,
8 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from
9 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

10 84. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
11 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of
12 DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a
13 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other
14 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal
15 and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to engage in these
16 unlawful and unfair business practices.

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

19 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.)**

20 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

21 85. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
22 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
23 Complaint.

24 86. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
25 for DEFENDANT’S willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the
26 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT’S failure to accurately calculate
27 and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

1 87. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public
2 policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

3 88. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
4 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than
5 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

6 89. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages,
7 including minimum wage compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of suit.

8 90. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
9 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
10 worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
11 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

13 91. DEFENDANT'S uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
14 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
15 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
16 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.

17 92. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
18 inaccurately calculated the amount of time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
19 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANT acted
20 in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of
21 the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable
22 laws and regulations.

23 93. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
24 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
25 minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

26 94. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked than they were entitled to, constituting a
28 failure to pay all earned wages.

1 95. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
2 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true
3 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have
4 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown
5 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

6 96. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
7 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are under-compensated for their time worked.
8 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
9 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform corporate policy, practice
10 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
11 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages
12 for their time worked.

13 97. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
14 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked
15 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act
16 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the
18 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal
19 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
20 these employees.

21 98. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore
22 request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
23 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
24 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage
25 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have
26 terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or
27 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab.
28 Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS

Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198)

(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

99. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

100. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

101. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked.

102. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and more than forty (40) hours per workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

103. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages, including minimum wage and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of suit. Cal. Lab. Code § 1198 further states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

104. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked, including overtime work.

1 105. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
2 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
3 implementing a uniform policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by
4 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to
5 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked,
6 including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
7 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

8 106. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
9 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
10 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal
11 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
12 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
13 regulations.

14 107. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
15 the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive full
16 compensation for overtime worked.

17 108. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
18 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the
19 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
20 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were not subject to a valid collective bargaining
21 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather,
22 PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of herself and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on
23 DEFENDANT's violations of non- negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
24 California.

25 109. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been paid less for overtime worked that they are entitled to,
27 constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

28

1 110. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay the PLAINTIFF and the other members of
2 the CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
3 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194 & 1198, even
4 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were required to work,
5 and did in fact work, overtime as to which DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay as
6 evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and witnessed by employees.

7 111. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
8 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
9 overtime worked by these employees, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are
11 presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

12 112. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
13 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all overtime worked.
14 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
15 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
16 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
17 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked.

18 113. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
19 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime
20 worked and provide them with the requisite overtime compensation, DEFENDANT acted and
21 continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other
22 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights,
23 or the consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property
24 and legal rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the
25 expense of these employees.

26 114. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore
27 request recovery of all unpaid wages, including overtime wages, according to proof, interest,
28 statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a

1 sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent
2 minimum and/or overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
3 Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor
4 Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these employees would also be entitled to waiting time
5 penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful,
7 intentional, and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

9 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

12 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

13 115. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
14 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
15 Complaint.

16 116. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
17 required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members as
18 required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by
19 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members did not prevent these employees from being
20 relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their
21 rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often not
22 fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT's
23 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required
24 meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
25 records. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were
27 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
28

members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

117. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a meal period was not provided.

118. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)

(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

119. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

120. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. In addition, DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as required by the

1 applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide
2 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid rest
3 periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

4 121. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
5 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
6 who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one
7 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that rest
8 period was not provided.

9 122. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial,
11 and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

12 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

14 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226)**

15 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

16 123. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
17 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

18 124. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
19 "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

- 20 a. Gross wages earned,
- 21 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
22 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment
23 of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
24 the Industrial Welfare Commission,
- 25 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
26 is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- 27 d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
28 may be aggregated and shown as one item,

- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. 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 of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

125. During the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

126. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS failed to provide itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

127. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period

1 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
2 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
3 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

4 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

6 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203)**

7 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

8 128. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
9 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
10 Complaint.

11 129. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

12 As used in this article:

- 13 (d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every
14 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
15 task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.
16 (e) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under
17 contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the to be
18 paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

19 130. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that "If an employer discharges
20 an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
21 immediately."

22 131. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

23 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
24 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
25 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
26 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
27 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
28 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and
designates a mailing address. 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.

132. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
Members' employment contract.

133. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

1 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with
2 Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
3 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.

4 134. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
5 terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who were
6 underpaid for minimum wage and/or overtime wage, and/or missed meal and rest breaks, as
7 required by law.

8 ~~135.~~ Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of herself and the
9 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has terminated, PLAINTIFF demand
10 up to thirty (30) days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all
11 employees who terminated employment during the CLASS PERIOD and demand an accounting
12 and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

13 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **Failure To Reimburse Employees For Required Expenses**

15 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

16 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

17 136. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
18 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
19 Complaint.

20 137. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

23 138. From time-to-time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab.
24 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the members of the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for
26 DEFENDANT's benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to
28 using their personal cellular phone all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cell phones to execute their essential job duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenses resulting from using their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of their expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

139. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement on behalf of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for expenditures or losses incurred in the discharge their job duties and on behalf of DEFENDANT, or his/her obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with interest at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for a judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
- c. An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all overtime wages and all sums unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and
- d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to

1 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

2 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 3 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth
4 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant
5 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 6 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
7 damages for overtime compensation and separately owed rest periods, due to
8 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the
9 applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- 10 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
11 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 12 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in
13 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding
15 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for
16 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226
- 17 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
18 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
19 therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

20 3. On all claims:

- 21 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 22 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- 23 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law.

24 DATED: May 4, 2022

25 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

26 By:  _____

27 Shani O. Zakay
28 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF demands a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

DATED: May 4, 2022

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: _____

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT