

**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**  
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)  
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)  
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)  
Rachel Newman (State Bar #350826)  
5440 Morehouse Dr., Ste 3600  
San Diego, CA 92121  
Telephone: (619)255-9047  
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203  
[shani@zakaylaw.com](mailto:shani@zakaylaw.com)  
[jackland@zakaylaw.com](mailto:jackland@zakaylaw.com)  
[julieann@zakaylaw.com](mailto:julieann@zakaylaw.com)  
[rachel@zakaylaw.com](mailto:rachel@zakaylaw.com)

**JCL LAW FIRM, APC**  
Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)  
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600  
San Diego, CA 92121  
Telephone: (619) 599-8292  
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291  
[jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com](mailto:jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com)

Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943)  
**LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC**  
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203  
Glendale, California 91203  
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

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

PASSION MORRIS, individually, and on  
behalf of other members of the general public  
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

HABERFELDE FORD, a California  
corporation; JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
an unknown business entity; and DOES 1  
through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: BCV-23-100471

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages);
- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 204 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment);

- (7) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
- (8) Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d) (Failure To Keep Requisite Payroll Records);
- (9) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);
- (10) Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.
- (11) Violation Of the Private Attorneys General Act Labor Code §§ 2698 ET SEQ.

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff PASSION MORRIS (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and alleges as follows:

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Kern. The majority of acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff and the other class members took place in the State of California, including the County

1 of Kern. At all relevant times, Defendants maintained their headquarters/“nerve center” within  
2 the State of California, County of Kern.

3 **PARTIES**

4 5. Plaintiff PASSION MORRIS is an individual residing in the State of California,  
5 County of Kern.

6 6. Defendant HABERFELDE FORD, at all times herein mentioned, was and is,  
7 upon information and belief, a California corporation and, at all times herein mentioned, an  
8 employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the  
9 County of Kern.

10 7. Defendant JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN, at all times herein mentioned, was  
11 and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the  
12 State of California, including the County of Kern.

13 8. At all relevant times, Defendant HABERFELDE FORD and Defendant JIM  
14 BURKE FORD LINCOLN were the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all  
15 applicable California laws and statutes.

16 9. At all times herein relevant, Defendants HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE  
17 FORD LINCOLN, and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint  
18 venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-  
19 conspirators and/or assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting  
20 within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint  
21 employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and/or assigns,  
22 and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge,  
23 permission, encouragement, authorization and/or consent of each defendant designated as a  
24 DOE herein.

25 10. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or  
26 otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who sues  
27 said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that  
28 information and belief alleges, that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally

1 responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused  
2 the injuries and damages to Plaintiff and the other class members as alleged in this Complaint.  
3 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and  
4 capacities when the same have been ascertained.

5 11. Defendant HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN, and DOES 1  
6 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as "Defendants."

7 12. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or  
8 affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of  
9 ///

10 Plaintiff and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers liable  
11 under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

12 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

13 13. Plaintiff bring this action on her own behalf and on behalf of all other members  
14 of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under California  
15 Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

16 14. The proposed class is defined as follows:

17 All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for  
18 any of the Defendants within the State of California at any time during the  
19 period from four years preceding the filing of this Complaint to final judgment  
20 and who reside in California.

21 **Subclass A:** All class members who received overtime compensation at a rate  
22 lower than their respective regular rate of pay because Defendants failed to  
23 include all shift differential pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-  
24 discretionary performance pay in the calculation of the regular rate of pay for  
25 overtime pay purposes.

26 **Subclass B:** All class members who were required by Defendants to stay on  
27 Defendants' premises for rest breaks.

28 **Subclass C:** All class members who were required by Defendants to perform

health and safety checks related to COVID-19 off-the-clock.

15. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish additional subclasses as appropriate.

16. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom she has a well-defined community of interest.

c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom she has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all class members is impractical.

e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great

1 state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees  
2 are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect  
3 retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are  
4 not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of  
5 their rights.

6 17. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that  
7 predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common  
8 questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

- 9 a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or  
10 reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- 11 b. Whether Defendants' had a corporate policy and practice of failing to  
12 pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of  
13 California for all hours worked and missed (short, late, interrupted,  
14 and/or missed altogether) meal periods and rest breaks in violation of  
15 California law;
- 16 c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to  
17 work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week  
18 and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff  
19 and the other class members;
- 20 d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of  
21 meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class  
22 members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- 23 e. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the  
24 other class members for all hours worked;
- 25 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other  
26 class members within the required time upon their discharge or  
27 resignation;
- 28 g. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and

the other class members during their employment;

- h. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code; including, *inter alia*, section 226;
- i. Whether Defendants kept complete and accurate payroll records as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 1174(d);
- j. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- k. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- l. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;
- m. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- n. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

18. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California, including the County of Kern.

19. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee, from approximately December 2019 to approximately October 2020, in the State of California, County of Kern.

20. Defendants hired Plaintiff and the other class members, classified them as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees, and failed to compensate them for all hours worked and missed meal periods and/or rest breaks.

21. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class members, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

22. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other class members.

23. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other class members.

24. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California

25. Plaintiff and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California. This pattern and practice involved, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all regular and/or overtime wages earned and for missed meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law.

27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving accurate overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to use the shift differential pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages where Plaintiff and the other class members earned shift differential pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay and overtime wages in the same workweek.

29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all required rest and meal periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

1           30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
3 all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class  
4 member's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, and they did not receive all meal  
5 periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class member's  
6 regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed.

7           31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
8 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
9 all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class  
10 member's regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not receive all rest  
11 periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class members'  
12 regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

13           32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
14 required Plaintiff and the other class members to remain on Defendants' premises during  
15 purported rest periods, thereby failing to relieve them of all employer control.

16           33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
17 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
18 at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum  
19 wages for all hours worked.

20           34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
21 required Plaintiff and the other class members to perform health and safety checks related to  
22 COVID-19 off-the-clock.

23           35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
24 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
25 all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum wages  
26 and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not, in fact, receive all such wages owed to  
27 them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

28           36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants

1 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
2 all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff and the other class members did  
3 not receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest  
4 period premiums, within any time permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

5 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
6 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
7 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, they did  
8 not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies  
9 included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the  
10 other class members.

11 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
12 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records  
13 for Plaintiff and the other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did  
14 not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

15 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
16 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to  
17 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

18 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
19 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and the other class  
20 members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such  
21 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely  
22 represented to Plaintiff and the other class members that they were properly denied wages, all  
23 in order to increase Defendants' profits.

24 41. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to  
25 Plaintiff and the other class members for all overtime hours worked. Plaintiff and the other  
26 class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours  
27 per week without overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

28 42. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide all requisite

uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members.

43. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to remain on Defendants' premises during purported rest periods, thereby failing to relieve them of all employer control.

44. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

45. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to perform health and safety checks related to COVID-19 off-the-clock.

46. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to use the shift differential pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages where Plaintiff and the other class members earned shift differential pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay and overtime wages in the same workweek.

47. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

48. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members all wages within any time permissible under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204.

49. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other class members.

50. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members.

51. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

52. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and the other class members pursuant to California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.

53. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to “sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty due to him [or her] under this article.”

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**

**and DOES 1 through 100)**

54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 53, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

55. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

56. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members employed by Defendants, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

57. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members overtime compensation at a rate of two times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

58. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in

1 excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day  
2 of work.

3 59. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members worked in  
4 excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

5 60. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to  
6 pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other class members.

7 61. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the unpaid  
8 balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of  
9 California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

10 62. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other class  
11 members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and  
12 attorneys' fees.

13 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))**

15 **(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**

16 **and DOES 1 through 100)**

17 63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1  
18 through 62, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set  
19 forth herein.

20 64. At all relevant times, the IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7  
21 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment by  
22 Defendants.

23 65. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no  
24 employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an  
25 applicable order of the California IWC.

26 66. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor  
27 Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to  
28 work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee

1 with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per  
2 day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual  
3 consent of both the employer and employee.

4 67. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor  
5 Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an  
6 employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the  
7 employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except  
8 that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may  
9 be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period  
10 was not waived.

11 68. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members who were  
12 scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive  
13 their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods  
14 longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30)  
15 minutes and/or rest period.

16 69. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members who were  
17 scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were required to work for  
18 periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty  
19 (30) minutes and/or rest period.

20 70. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required  
21 Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate  
22 Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium for work performed during  
23 meal periods.

24 71. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other  
25 class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section  
26 226.7.

27 72. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor  
28 Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

73. Pursuant to applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(c), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
and DOES 1 through 100)**

74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 73, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

75. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

76. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

77. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours.

78. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and other class members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

79. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class

members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest periods.

80. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

81. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

82. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7(c), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided.

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**

**and DOES 1 through 100)**

83. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 82, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

84. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

85. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiff and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

86. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorney's fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

88. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

**(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202)**

89. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 88, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

91. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

92. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants' their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

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

5           94.     Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the  
6 statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum  
7 pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

8                                   **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9                                   **(Violation of California Labor Code § 204)**

10                           **(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**

11                                   **and DOES 1 through 100)**

12           95.     Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1  
13 through 94, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set  
14 forth herein.

15           96.     At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all  
16 wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of  
17 any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and  
18 payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was  
19 performed.

20           97.     At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all  
21 wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive,  
22 of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due  
23 and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

24           98.     At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all  
25 wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the  
26 payday for the next regular payroll period.

27     ///

28     ///

100. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover all remedies available for violations of California Labor Code section 204.

**(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
and DOES 1 through 100)**

101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 100, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

102. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

103. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include,

but are not limited to: the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the other class members.

104. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

105. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate and itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

106. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per employee.

107. Plaintiff and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(h).

### **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **(Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d))**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN, and DOES 1 through 100)**

108. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 107, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

109. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d), an employer shall keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance

///

1 with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file  
2 for not less than two years.

3 110. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete  
4 payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Plaintiff and the other  
5 class members.

6 111. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d),  
7 Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-  
8 protected rights.

9 112. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by  
10 Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) because  
11 they were denied both their legal right and protected interest, in having available, accurate and  
12 complete payroll records pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d).

13 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)**

15 **(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**

16 **and DOES 1 through 100)**

17 113. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1  
18 through 112, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set  
19 forth herein.

20 114. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must  
21 reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct  
22 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her  
23 obedience to the directions of the employer.

24 115. Plaintiff and the other class members incurred necessary business-related  
25 expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants.

26 116. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the  
27 other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

28 ///

117. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

**TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**

**and DOES 1 through 100)**

118. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 117, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

119. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, other class members, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

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

121. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq. may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Defendants' policies and practices of failing to pay minimum wages violate California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other class members violate

1 California Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 204. Defendants also violated California Labor  
2 Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

3 122. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants  
4 unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

5 123. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured by  
6 Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not  
7 necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

8 124. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, et seq.,  
9 Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and  
10 retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years preceding the filing of this  
11 Complaint; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section  
12 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

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

14 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

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

16 125. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth  
17 herein, the prior paragraphs of this First Amended Complaint.

18 126. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state  
19 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of  
20 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is  
21 fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit  
22 private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create  
23 a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In  
24 enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to  
25 allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for  
26 Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1.

27 127. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy  
28 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General

1 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to herself  
2 and all individuals classified as all non-exempt and/or commission-based and/or piece-rate based  
3 employees who worked for Defendant HABERFELDE FORD and/or Defendant JIM BURKE  
4 FORD LINCOLN in California during the time period from March 18, 2023 through June 13,  
5 2024 (the "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES").

6 128. On March 18, 2024, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by certified mail to the  
7 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the specific  
8 provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See  
9 Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting  
10 period for Plaintiff to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant  
11 to Section 2699.3, Plaintiff may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA  
12 pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED  
13 EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

14 129. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful  
15 business act or practice because DEFENDANTS (a) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES  
16 minimum wages and overtime wages, (b) failed to provide AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES legally  
17 required meal and rest breaks, (c) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct  
18 regular rate of pay, (d) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, and (e)  
19 failed to timely pay wages, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor  
20 Code §2699.5, including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5,  
21 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197,  
22 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, and the applicable Industrial Wage  
23 Order(s), and thereby gives rise to statutory penalties as a result of such conduct. PLAINTIFF  
24 hereby seeks recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney  
25 General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct  
26 perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

27 130. For all provisions of the Labor Code for which civil penalty is not specifically  
28 provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred dollars

(§100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (§200) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs in connection with their claims for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(g)(1).

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

#### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, requests a trial by jury.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

#### **Class Certification**

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current/last known contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

///

///

**As to the First Cause of Action**

5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members;

6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194; and

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Second Cause of Action**

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the other class members;

11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

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

13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

///

///

**As to the Third Cause of Action**

17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members;

18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

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

20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due; and

22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members;

24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for Plaintiff and the other class members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

26. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due;

27. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);

28. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and the other class members no longer employed by Defendants;

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

32. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for Plaintiff and the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

33. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Sixth Cause of Action**

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiff and the other class members;

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

37. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

38. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Seventh Cause of Action**

39. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the other class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

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

41. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

42. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(h); and

43. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

44. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 1174(d) by willfully failing to keep accurate and complete payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members as required by California Labor Code section 1174(d);

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

46. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5; and

47. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Ninth Cause of Action**

48. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

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

50. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

51. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

52. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Tenth Cause of Action**

53. That the Court decree, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. by failing to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and the other class members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202 and 204 and by violating California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

1           54.     For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all the other class members and  
2 all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

3           55.     For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all  
4 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by  
5 Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections  
6 17200, et seq.;

7           56.     For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to  
8 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

9           57.     For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to  
10 California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq.; and

11          58.     For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

12          59.     **As to the Eleventh Cause of Action** On behalf of PLAINTIFF as an  
13 individual and the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES:  
14 Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of  
15 2004.

16     Dated: July 3, 2024

**JCL LAW FIRM, APC**  
**ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

18  
19 By:   
20 Shani O. Zakay, Esq.  
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.

# **EXHIBIT 1**



Client #70201

March 18, 2024

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

Online Filing

**HABERFELDE FORD****JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN**

c/o James Joseph Hay

2001 Oak Street

Bakersfield, CA 93301

***Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0410 5648 30***

**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, 2804, and 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 PASSION MORRIS ("Plaintiff") and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendants HABERFELDE FORD ("Defendant Haberfelde Ford") and JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN ("Defendant Jim Burke Ford Lincoln") (collectively, "Defendants"). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants in California from December of 2019 to October of 2020, 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. Plaintiff further contends that Defendants failed to advise Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods when working on a commission and/or commission draw basis and failed to separately compensate Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees for the non-productive time, including for their rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC* (2017) 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110.

As a consequence, Plaintiff contends that Defendants failed to fully compensate her and other similarly situated and aggrieved employees, for all earned wages and failed to provide California-compliant meal and rest breaks and accurate wage statements. Accordingly, Plaintiff contends that Defendants' conduct violated 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, 2804, and applicable wage orders, and is therefore actionable pursuant to section 2698 *et seq.*

**Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as all non-exempt,**

**commission-based and/or piece-rate based employees who worked for Defendant Haberfelde Ford and/or Defendant Jim Burke Ford Lincoln in California during the relevant claim period.**

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint is attached hereto. The Complaint (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iv) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to the Plaintiff, and (v) 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 are 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 Act 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.

Sincerely,



Shani O. Zakay  
Attorney for Plaintiff

# SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

## NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

HABERFELDE FORD, a California corporation;  
"Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

## YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

PASSION MORRIS, individually, and on behalf of other members of  
the general public similarly situated;

FOR COURT USE ONLY  
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
2/16/2023

Kern County Superior Court  
By Vanessa Castro, Deputy

**NOTICE!** You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. **¡AVISO!** Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California ([www.sucorte.ca.gov](http://www.sucorte.ca.gov)), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, ([www.sucorte.ca.gov](http://www.sucorte.ca.gov)) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. **AVISO:** Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:  
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Superior Court of the State of California  
County of Kern-Metropolitan Division  
1415 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, California 93301

CASE NUMBER:  
(Número del Caso):

BCV-23-100471

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:  
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):  
Edwin Aiwarzian, 410 Arden Avenue, Suite 203, Glendale, CA 91203; Telephone (818) 265-1020

DATE:  
(Fecha) 2/16/2023

TAMARAH HARBER-PICKENS

Clerk, by  
(Secretario)

, Deputy  
(Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]



### NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.
2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3. ☐ on behalf of (specify):
 

|                                                                  |                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| under: <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.10 (corporation)         | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.60 (minor)             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)        | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.70 (conservatee)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.90 (authorized person) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (specify):                        |                                                         |
4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

|                                                    |                               |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| SHORT TITLE:<br>Morris vs. Haberfelde Ford, et al. | CASE NUMBER:<br>BCV-23-100471 |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE**

- ➔ This form may be used as an attachment to any summons if space does not permit the listing of all parties on the summons.
- ➔ If this attachment is used, insert the following statement in the plaintiff or defendant box on the summons: "Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

**List additional parties** (Check only one box. Use a separate page for each type of party.):

☐ Plaintiff
 ☒ Defendant
 ☐ Cross-Complainant
 ☐ Cross-Defendant

JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN, an unknown business entity; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

EXHIBIT 1

Edwin Aiwarzian (SBN 232943)  
**LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC**  
410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203  
Glendale, California 91203  
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

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

PASSION MORRIS, individually, and on  
behalf of other members of the general public  
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

HABERFELDE FORD, a California  
corporation; JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
an unknown business entity; and DOES 1  
through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: BCV-23-100471

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR  
DAMAGES**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages);
- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 204 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment);
- (7) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
- (8) Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d) (Failure To Keep Requisite Payroll Records);
- (9) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);
- (10) Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff PASSION MORRIS (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and alleges as follows:

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Kern. The majority of acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff and the other class members took place in the State of California, including the County of Kern. At all relevant times, Defendants maintained their headquarters/“nerve center” within the State of California, County of Kern.

### **PARTIES**

5. Plaintiff PASSION MORRIS is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Kern.

6. Defendant HABERFELDE FORD, at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a California corporation and, at all times herein mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Kern.

7. Defendant JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN, at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Kern.

8. At all relevant times, Defendant HABERFELDE FORD and Defendant JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN were the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable California laws and statutes.

9. At all times herein relevant, Defendants HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN, and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and/or assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and/or assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and/or consent of each defendant designated as a DOE herein.

10. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff and the other class members as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

11. Defendant HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN, and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

12. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of

///

Plaintiff and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

13. Plaintiff bring this action on her own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

14. The proposed class is defined as follows:

All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants within the State of California at any time during the period from four years preceding the filing of this Complaint to final judgment and who reside in California.

**Subclass A:** All class members who received overtime compensation at a rate lower than their respective regular rate of pay because Defendants failed to include all shift differential pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay in the calculation of the regular rate of pay for overtime pay purposes.

**Subclass B:** All class members who were required by Defendants to stay on Defendants' premises for rest breaks.

**Subclass C:** All class members who were required by Defendants to perform health and safety checks related to COVID-19 off-the-clock.

15. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish additional subclasses as appropriate.

16. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment records.

- b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom she has a well-defined community of interest.
- c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom she has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.
- d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all class members is impractical.
- e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

17. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

///

- a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- b. Whether Defendants' had a corporate policy and practice of failing to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California for all hours worked and missed (short, late, interrupted, and/or missed altogether) meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- e. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members for all hours worked;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- g. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members during their employment;
- h. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code; including, *inter alia*, section 226;
- i. Whether Defendants kept complete and accurate payroll records as required by the California Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 1174(d);
- j. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;

- k. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- l. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;
- m. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- n. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

18. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California, including the County of Kern.

19. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee, from approximately December 2019 to approximately October 2020, in the State of California, County of Kern.

20. Defendants hired Plaintiff and the other class members, classified them as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees, and failed to compensate them for all hours worked and missed meal periods and/or rest breaks.

21. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class members, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

22. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other class members.

23. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other class members.

24. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

///

25. Plaintiff and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California. This pattern and practice involved, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all regular and/or overtime wages earned and for missed meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law.

27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving accurate overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to use the shift differential pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay to calculate the regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages where Plaintiff and the other class members earned shift differential pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay and overtime wages in the same workweek.

29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all required rest and meal periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class member's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, and they did not receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class member's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed.

///

1           31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
3 all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class  
4 member's regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not receive all rest  
5 periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and the other class members'  
6 regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

7           32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
8 required Plaintiff and the other class members to remain on Defendants' premises during  
9 purported rest periods, thereby failing to relieve them of all employer control.

10           33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
11 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
12 at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum  
13 wages for all hours worked.

14           34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
15 required Plaintiff and the other class members to perform health and safety checks related to  
16 COVID-19 off-the-clock.

17           35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
18 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
19 all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum wages  
20 and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not, in fact, receive all such wages owed to  
21 them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

22           36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
23 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive  
24 all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff and the other class members did  
25 not receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest  
26 period premiums, within any time permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

27           37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
28 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive

1 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, they did  
2 not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies  
3 included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and the  
4 other class members.

5 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
6 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records  
7 for Plaintiff and the other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did  
8 not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

9 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
10 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to  
11 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

12 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants  
13 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and the other class  
14 members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such  
15 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely  
16 represented to Plaintiff and the other class members that they were properly denied wages, all  
17 in order to increase Defendants' profits.

18 41. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to  
19 Plaintiff and the other class members for all overtime hours worked. Plaintiff and the other  
20 class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours  
21 per week without overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.

22 42. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide all requisite  
23 uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members.

24 43. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class  
25 members to remain on Defendants' premises during purported rest periods, thereby failing to  
26 relieve them of all employer control.

27 44. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other  
28 class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

1           45.     During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class  
2 members to perform health and safety checks related to COVID-19 off-the-clock.

3           46.     During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to use the shift differential  
4 pay/commissions/non-discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay to calculate the  
5 regular rate of pay used to calculate the overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages where  
6 Plaintiff and the other class members earned shift differential pay/commissions/non-  
7 discretionary bonuses/non-discretionary performance pay and overtime wages in the same  
8 workweek.

9           47.     During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other  
10 class members all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

11           48.     During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other  
12 class members all wages within any time permissible under California law, including, *inter*  
13 *alia*, California Labor Code section 204.

14           49.     During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to provide complete or  
15 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other class members.

16           50.     During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to keep complete or accurate  
17 payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members.

18           51.     During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the  
19 other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

20           52.     During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to properly compensate  
21 Plaintiff and the other class members pursuant to California law in order to increase  
22 Defendants' profits.

23           53.     California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor  
24 Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty  
25 due to him [or her] under this article."

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**

**and DOES 1 through 100)**

54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 53, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

55. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

56. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members employed by Defendants, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

57. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members overtime compensation at a rate of two times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

58. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

59. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

60. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other class members.

61. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

62. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
and DOES 1 through 100)**

63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 62, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

64. At all relevant times, the IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

65. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

66. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

///

67. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

68. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or rest period.

69. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or rest period.

70. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium for work performed during meal periods.

71. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

72. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

73. Pursuant to applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(c), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one

///

1 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that  
2 the meal or rest period is not provided.

3 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)**

5 **(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**  
6 **and DOES 1 through 100)**

7 74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1  
8 through 73, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set  
9 forth herein.

10 75. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California  
11 Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members'  
12 employment by Defendants.

13 76. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no  
14 employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable  
15 order of the California IWC.

16 77. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very  
17 employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as  
18 practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be  
19 based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4)  
20 hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half  
21 (3 ½) hours.

22 78. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and other class  
23 members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute  
24 rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

25 79. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the  
26 other class members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class  
27 members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest periods.

28 ///

80. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

81. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

82. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7(c), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
and DOES 1 through 100)**

83. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 82, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

84. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

85. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiff and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

86. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorney's fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

///

87. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover a penalty of \$100.00 for the initial failure to timely pay each employee minimum wages, and \$250.00 for each subsequent failure to pay each employee minimum wages.

88. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
and DOES 1 through 100)**

89. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 88, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

91. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

92. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants' their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

93. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then 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 is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

94. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code § 204)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
and DOES 1 through 100)**

95. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 94, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

96. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

97. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

98. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

///

///

99. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members all wages due to them, within any time period permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

100. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover all remedies available for violations of California Labor Code section 204.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,  
and DOES 1 through 100)**

101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 100, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

102. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

103. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include,

1 but are not limited to: the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and  
2 the other class members.

3 104. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a),  
4 Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-  
5 protected rights.

6 105. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by  
7 Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because  
8 they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving,  
9 accurate and itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

10 106. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the  
11 greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor  
12 Code section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per  
13 employee.

14 107. Plaintiff and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to  
15 ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(h).

16 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d))**

18 **(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN, and DOES 1 through**  
19 **100)**

20 108. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1  
21 through 107, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set  
22 forth herein.

23 109. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d), an employer shall keep, at a  
24 central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are  
25 employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the  
26 number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees  
27 employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance

28 ///

1 with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file  
2 for not less than two years.

3 110. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete  
4 payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Plaintiff and the other  
5 class members.

6 111. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d),  
7 Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-  
8 protected rights.

9 112. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by  
10 Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) because  
11 they were denied both their legal right and protected interest, in having available, accurate and  
12 complete payroll records pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d).

13 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)**

15 **(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**  
16 **and DOES 1 through 100)**

17 113. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1  
18 through 112, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set  
19 forth herein.

20 114. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must  
21 reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct  
22 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her  
23 obedience to the directions of the employer.

24 115. Plaintiff and the other class members incurred necessary business-related  
25 expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants.

26 116. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the  
27 other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

28 ///

117. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

**TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)**

**(Against HABERFELDE FORD, JIM BURKE FORD LINCOLN,**

**and DOES 1 through 100)**

118. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 117, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

119. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, other class members, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

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

121. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, et seq. may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiff and the other class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Defendants' policies and practices of failing to pay minimum wages violate California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and the other class members violate

California Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 204. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

122. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

123. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

124. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years preceding the filing of this Complaint; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

#### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, requests a trial by jury.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

#### **Class Certification**

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current/last known contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

///

///

**As to the First Cause of Action**

5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members;

6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194; and

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Second Cause of Action**

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the other class members;

11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

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

13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

///

///

**As to the Third Cause of Action**

17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members;

18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

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

20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due; and

22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members;

24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for Plaintiff and the other class members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

26. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due;

27. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);

28. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and the other class members no longer employed by Defendants;

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

32. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for Plaintiff and the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

33. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Sixth Cause of Action**

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiff and the other class members;

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

37. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

38. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Seventh Cause of Action**

39. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the other class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

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

41. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

42. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(h); and

43. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

44. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 1174(d) by willfully failing to keep accurate and complete payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members as required by California Labor Code section 1174(d);

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

46. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5; and

47. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Ninth Cause of Action**

48. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

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

50. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

51. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

52. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**As to the Tenth Cause of Action**

53. That the Court decree, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. by failing to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and the other class members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202 and 204 and by violating California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), 2800 and 2802.

54. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all the other class members and all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

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

56. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

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

58. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: February 14, 2023

**LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC**

By: 

Edwin Aiwanian  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

**1. Article Addressed to:**

Haberfelde Ford  
Jim Burke Ford Lincoln  
c/o James Joseph Hay  
2001 Oak Street  
Bakersfield, CA 93301



9590 9402 8438 3156 5217 43

**2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)**

39 0710 5270 0410 5648 30

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

**COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY****A. Signature****X**☒ Agent☐ Addressee**B. Received by (Printed Name)**

Paul Deen

**C. Date of Delivery**

03-22-24

**D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☒ Yes**If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

002-623

03/18

Morris

PO BOX  
2088  
Bak, CA 93303**3. Service Type**

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt