

SUMMONS

(CITACION JUDICIAL)

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

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

TERRA VISTA MANAGEMENT, INC., a California corporation; CAMPLAND, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; (Additional Parties Attachment Attached)

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

SHANE ANDERSEN, on behalf of the State of California in his representative capacity as a private attorney general,

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

10/21/2024 7:24:19 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By C. Martinez, Deputy Clerk

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), 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), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (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), 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), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (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): San Diego Superior Court

Hall of Justice Courthouse - 330 W. Broadway, San Diego, CA 92101

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

24CU018389C

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):

Shani O. Zakay, Esq. T: (619) 255-9047 Zakay Law Group, APLC - 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE:
(Fecha) October 22, 2024

Clerk, by C. Martinez, Deputy
(Secretario) C. Martinez (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

- ☐ as an individual defendant.
- ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
- ☐ on behalf of (specify):
under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation) ☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)
☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) ☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) ☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
☐ other (specify):
- ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

SHORT TITLE: Shane Andersen v. Terra Vista Management, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER: 24CU018389C
---	------------------------------------

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

DE ANZA SAN DIEGO FOOD AND BEVERAGE, INC., a California corporation; DE ANZA CORPORATION, a California corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
Rachel Newman (State Bar #350826)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
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
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

SHANE ANDERSEN, on behalf of the State of
California in his representative capacity as a
private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

v.

TERRA VISTA MANAGEMENT, INC., a
California corporation; CAMPLAND, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; DE ANZA
SAN DIEGO FOOD AND BEVERAGE, INC.,
a California corporation; DE ANZA
CORPORATION, a California corporation; and
DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

10/21/2024 7:24:19 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By C. Martinez ,Deputy Clerk

Case No: 24CU018389C

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:

1) VIOLATIONS OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR
CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ.

1 PLAINTIFF SHANE ANDERSEN ("PLAINTIFF") on behalf of the people of the State of
2 California, and as an "aggrieved employee" acting as a private attorney general under the Labor
3 Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* ("PAGA") only, alleges on information
4 and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the
5 following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against TERRA VISTA MANAGEMENT, INC.;
8 CAMPLAND, LLC; DE ANZA SAN DIEGO FOOD AND BEVERAGE, INC.; and DE ANZA
9 CORPORATION, ("DEFENDANT" and/or "DEFENDANTS") seeking only to recover PAGA
10 civil penalties on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for
11 DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as**
12 **permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.** To the extent that statutory violations are
13 mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special
14 damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code §
15 2699.

16 2. California has enacted the PAGA which permits PLAINTIFF to bring an
17 action on behalf of others for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole nature of this
18 action.

19 3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for DEFENDANTS'
20 violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA that is, penalties and any
21 other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to PAGA. Nothing in this complaint should be
22 constructed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in a PAGA- only action.

23 4. PLAINTIFF is not suing in his individual capacity; he is proceeding herein solely
24 under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees. Nothing in this
25 complaint should be construed as PLAINTIFF suing his individual capacity

26 5. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANTS
27 decreased their employment-related costs by systematically violating California wage and hour
28 laws.

6. DEFENDANTS' systematic pattern of wage and hour and IWC Wage Order violations toward PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees in California include, *inter alia*:

- a. Failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods;
- b. Failure to allow employees to take duty-free meal and rest periods;
- c. Failure to pay all minimum, sick pay, regular and overtime wages;
- d. Failure to correctly calculate the regular rate of pay;
- e. Failure to pay within seven (7) days of the close of payroll;
- f. Failure to pay for all hours worked;
- g. Failure to maintain true and accurate records;
- h. Failure to reimburse for required business expenses;
- i. Failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- j. Failure to timely pay wages due during, and upon termination of employment.

7. PLAINTIFF reserves the right to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

THE PARTIES

8. Defendant TERRA VISTA MANAGEMENT, INC. (“Defendant Terra Vista”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

9. Defendant CAMPLAND, LLC (“Defendant Campland”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

10. Defendant DE ANZA SAN DIEGO FOOD AND BEVERAGE, INC. (“Defendant De Anza San Diego”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

11. 10. Defendant DE ANZA CORPORATION (“Defendant De Anza”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

/ / /

1 12. Defendant Terra Vista, Defendant Campland, Defendant De Anza San Diego, and
2 Defendant De Anza were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
3 EMPLOYEES as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
4 EMPLOYEES, by the company PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES performed
5 work for respectively, and as these entities each exerted control over the hours, wages and/or
6 working conditions of PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Therefore, Defendant
7 Terra Vista, Defendant Campland, Defendant De Anza San Diego, and Defendant De Anza are
8 jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or
9 “DEFENDANT.”

10 13. DEFENDANTS were the employer of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents
11 issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for.

12 14. DEFENDANTS operate property management companies throughout the state of
13 California, including in the county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

14 15. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from September of
15 2022 to June of 2024, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest
16 periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

17 16. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
18 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
19 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all non-
20 exempt employees who worked for Defendant Terra Vista and/or Defendant Campland and/or
21 Defendant De Anza San Diego and/or Defendant De Anza in California and classified as non-
22 exempt employees (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of August 16, 2023,
23 and the present (“PAGA Period”).

24 17. PLAINTIFF is an “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE” within the meaning of Labor
25 Code § 2699(c) because he was employed by DEFENDANTS and personally suffered each of the
26 alleged Labor Code violations committed by DEFENDANTS.

27
28 ///

18. PLAINTIFF and all other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are, and at all relevant times were, employees of DEFENDANTS, within the meanings set forth in the California Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

19. Each of the fictitiously named defendants participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint. The true names and capacities of the Defendants named as DOES 1 THROUGH 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF. PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint, setting forth the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named Defendants when their true names are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitious Defendants have participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint.

20. DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 THROUGH 50 (hereinafter collectively “DEFENDANTS”), were PLAINTIFF’S employers or persons acting on behalf of PLAINTIFF’S employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558, at all relevant times.

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

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

22. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This Court has jurisdiction over AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' claims for civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §2698, *et seq.*

23. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS (i) currently maintain and at all relevant times

maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conduct substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

THE CONDUCT

24. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses, and knowingly and intentionally failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against DEFENDANTS, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

A. Meal Period Violations

25. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS were required to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work

1 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANTS' control. Specifically,
2 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to
3 be PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not
4 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
5 forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time
6 being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
7 overtime rates. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
8 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
9 records.

10 26. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
11 schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
12 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
13 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
14 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for
15 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
16 DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second
17 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by
18 DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by
19 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES does not qualify for the limited and narrowly
20 construed "on-duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods,
21 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain
22 on duty and on call. Further, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, required PLAINTIFF and other
23 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and
24 respond to work-related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal
25 breaks. DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
26 with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records. PLAINTIFF
27 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation
28 and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

1 **B. Rest Period Violations**

2 27. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
3 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being
4 provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
5 DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
6 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
7 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some
8 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and
9 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
10 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
11 EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on premises, on duty and/or on call
12 and/or on the premises. Further, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, required PLAINTIFF and
13 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to maintain cordless communication devices in order to
14 receive and respond to work-related communications during what was supposed to be their off-
15 duty rest breaks. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided
16 with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and
17 DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were
18 from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS'
19 managers.

20 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

21 28. DEFENDANTS as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure,
22 intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF
23 and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by the
24 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of discharging their
25 duties on behalf of DEFENDANTS. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are
26 required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their
27 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her
28 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence

1 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer,
2 even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
3 to be unlawful."

4 29. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and
5 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
6 phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties.
7 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to use their
8 personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools in order to perform work related tasks.
9 However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES for the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phones,
11 personal vehicles, and personal tools. As a result, in the course of their employment with
12 DEFENDANTS, the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed
13 business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal
14 cell phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools, all on behalf of and for the benefit of
15 DEFENDANTS.

16 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

25 31. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
26 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed
27 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS also failed
28 to provide PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage

1 statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours worked and
2 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding amount of time
3 worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest
4 periods.

5 32. DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other
6 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements that provided the accurate name and address
7 of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8). Further,
8 DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
9 EMPLOYEES with wage statements that provided all applicable hourly rates in effect during the
10 pay period and corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee in
11 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(9).

12 33. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide
13 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members with wage statements that comply
14 with Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

15 34. As a result, DEFENDANTS issued PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
16 EMPLOYEES with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANTS'
17 violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional payroll error due
18 to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

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

20 35. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS failed and
21 continue to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours
22 worked.

23 36. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required
24 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including,
25 but not limited to, opening and closing keyholder duties. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and
26 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to have to work while off-the-clock.

27 37. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-
28 the-clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

1 38. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
2 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

3 39. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and
4 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to document,
5 track, or pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages earned and owed for all
6 the work they performed.

7 40. PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were non-exempt employees,
8 subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

9 41. DEFENDANTS' policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
10 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed for
11 the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
12 typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than eight (8) hours per day,
13 DEFENDANTS' policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

14 42. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
15 EMPLOYEES' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

16 43. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to
17 them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control, and benefit for the time spent
18 working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, opening and closing keyholder duties
19 and responding to resident/visitors inquires while on-call, but without pay. DEFENDANTS'
20 uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for
21 all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
22 records.

23 **F. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**
24 **and Redeemed Sick Pay**

25 44. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and
26 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED
27 EMPLOYEES for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums,
28 and redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES

1 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
2 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
3 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
4 EMPLOYEES Members at the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and
5 rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by
6 DEFENDANTS' business records.

7 45. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
8 their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were
9 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
10 employee's performance.

11 46. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES'
12 compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF
13 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' incentive wages based on their performance for
14 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
15 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
16 DEFENDANTS.

17 47. From-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay periods
18 where PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked overtime, double time, paid
19 meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-discretionary
20 bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus compensation as
21 part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked rather than just all
22 non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the incentive/bonus program
23 to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the
24 incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be
25 included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment
26 of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay
27 to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANTS. Specifically,
28 California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time for non-employees shall be

1 calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt
2 employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that
3 workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive
4 compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of sick pay compensation was in
5 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is recoverable under Cal. Labor Code
6 Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

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

18 **G. Sick Pay Violations**

19 49. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that "An employee who, on or after
20 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from
21 the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section."
22 Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From
23 time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided
24 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with sick days and/or paid sick leave. As of
25 January 1, 2024, DEFENDANTS failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide and
26 allow employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

27 50. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its
28 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.

1 From time to time, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish
2 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements setting forth the amount of
3 paid sick leave available.

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

5 51. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
6 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment.
7 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time, did not receive payment
8 of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period
9 premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

10 52. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, “If an employer discharges an employee, the
11 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.” Pursuant to
12 Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, “his or her wages shall become
13 due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours
14 previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her
15 wages at the time of quitting.” PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from time
16 to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or at
17 the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202. Further, DEFENDANTS’
18 violations are willful and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional payroll error due
19 to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

20 53. As such, PLAINTIFF demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not timely
21 paying all wages due at time of termination for all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose
22 employment ended during the PAGA PERIOD.

23 **I. Unlawful Deductions**

24 54. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
25 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ pay without explanations and without authorization to do so
26 or notice to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. As a result, DEFENDANTS
27 violated Labor Code § 221.

28 ///

1 **J. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

14 56. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
15 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' time
16 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding
17 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work as
18 ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
19 duty meal break.

20 **K. Timekeeping Manipulation**

21 57. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
22 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
23 EMPLOYEES for the actual time PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked each
24 day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal and rest breaks. As a result,
25 DEFENDANTS were able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally alter the time recorded
26 in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in
27 order to avoid paying these employees for all hours worked, applicable overtime compensation,
28 applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed rest break.

1 58. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time-to-time,
2 forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without
3 compensation at the applicable pay rates.

4 59. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
5 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
6 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
7 EMPLOYEES clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees were not
8 at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of DEFENDANTS'
9 uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30) minute off-duty meal
10 breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

11 60. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due
12 them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit for the time the
13 timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay
14 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in accordance with
15 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

16 61. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
17 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
18 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
19 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
20 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required
21 by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF
22 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
23 DEFENDANTS policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
24 supposed to be his off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
25 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy
26 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to
27 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANTS also failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF
28 for required business expenses related to the personal expenses incurred for the use of his personal

1 cell phone, personal vehicle, and purchase of tools, on behalf of and in furtherance of his
2 employment with DEFENDANTS. To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the
3 minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to him or any penalty wages owed
4 to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does
5 not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

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

10 62. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
11 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

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

21 64. At all relevant times, for the reasons described herein, and others, PLAINTIFF and
22 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS within the
23 meaning of Labor Code Section 2699(c).

24 65. Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (k) authorize an AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE,
25 like PLAINTIFF, on behalf of other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to
26 recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code Section 2699.3

27 66. PLAINTIFF complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
28 Code Section 2699.3. By certified letter, return receipt requested, dated August 16, 2024,

1 PLAINTIFF gave written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”)
2 and to DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been
3 violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. See Exhibit #1.

4 67. As of the date of this complaint, more than sixty-five (65) days after serving the
5 LWDA with notice of DEFENDANTS’ violations, the LWDA has not provided any notice by
6 certified mail of its intent to investigate the DEFENDANTS’ alleged violations as mandated by
7 Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(A). Accordingly, pursuant to Labor Code Section
8 2699.3(a)(2)A, PLAINTIFF may commence and is authorized to pursue this cause of action.

9 68. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (f), the AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES are entitled to civil penalties for DEFENDANTS’ violations of Labor Code
11 Section 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510,
12 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802 and 2804 in
13 the following amounts:

14 a. For violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and 204, up to (\$200)
15 per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period [penalty per Labor Code
16 Section 2699(f)];

17 b. For violations of Labor Code Section 226(a), a civil penalty in the amount
18 of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for
19 any initial violation and one thousand dollars for each subsequent violation
20 [penalty per Labor Code Section 226.3];

21 c. For violations of Labor Code Sections 204, a civil penalty in the amount of
22 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for any initial
23 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for
24 each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 210];

25 d. For violations of Labor Code Sections 226.7, 510 and 512, a civil penalty
26 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid AGGRIEVED
27 EMPLOYEE for the initial violation and hundred dollars (\$100) for each
28 underpaid AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty

per Labor Code Section 558];

e. For violations of Labor Code Section 1174(d), a civil penalty in the amount of five hundred (\$500) dollars for per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE [penalty per Labor Code Section 1174.5].

f. For violations of Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198 and 1199, a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars fifty (\$250) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section].

69. For all provisions of the Labor Code for which civil penalty is not specifically provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendant a penalty of up to two hundred dollars (\$200) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period. 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(k)(1).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

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

2. For civil penalties to the extent permitted bylaw pursuant to the Labor Code under the Private Attorneys General Act; and

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

DATED: October 21, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: _____

Shani O. Zakay

Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP

A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Client #93501

August 16, 2024

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendants

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Online Filing

TERRA VISTA MANAGEMENT, INC.

c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service

2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N

Sacramento, CA 95833

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1166 8825 82

CAMPLAND, LLC

c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service

2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N

Sacramento, CA 95833

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1166 8825 75

DE ANZA SAN DIEGO FOOD AND BEVERAGE, INC.

c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service

2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N

Sacramento, CA 95833

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1166 8825 68

DE ANZA CORPORATION

c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service

2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N

Sacramento, CA 95833

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1166 8825 99

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, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Our offices represent Plaintiff SHANE ANDERSEN ("Plaintiff"), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant TERRA VISTA MANAGEMENT, INC. ("Defendant Terra Vista"), Defendant CAMPLAND, LLC ("Defendant Campland"), Defendant DE ANZA SAN DIEGO FOOD AND BEVERAGE, INC., ("Defendant De Anza San Diego"), and Defendant DE ANZA CORPORATION ("Defendant De Anza") (hereinafter, collectively, "Defendants"). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from September of 2022 to June of 2024,

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

As a consequence of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff further contends that Defendants failed to provide accurate wage statements to him and other aggrieved employees, which among other violations of California Labor Code section 226(a). Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, violates the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant Terra Vista and/or Defendant Campland and/or Defendant De Anza San Diego and/or Defendant De Anza in California during the relevant claim period.

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

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

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

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

Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees.

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

Sincerely,



Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT

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 Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
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

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

SHANE ANDERSEN, an individual, on behalf
of himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

TERRA VISTA MANAGEMENT, INC., a
California corporation; CAMPLAND, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; DE ANZA
SAN DIEGO FOOD AND BEVERAGE, INC.,
a California corporation; DE ANZA
CORPORATION, a California corporation; and
DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

- 1 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
2 ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN
3 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
4 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
5 DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
6 CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
7 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
8 FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN
9 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802.

10 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

11 PLAINTIFF SHANE ANDERSEN (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and
12 all other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief, except
13 for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

14 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

15 1. Defendant TERRA VISTA MANAGEMENT, INC. (“Defendant Terra Vista”) is
16 a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to
17 conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

18 2. Defendant CAMPLAND, LLC (“Defendant Campland”) is a Delaware limited
19 liability that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial
20 and regular business throughout California.

21 3. Defendant DE ANZA SAN DIEGO FOOD AND BEVERAGE, INC. (“Defendant
22 De Anza San Diego”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein
23 conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

24 4. Defendant DE ANZA CORPORATION (“Defendant De Anza”) is a California
25 corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct
26 substantial and regular business throughout California.

27 5. Defendant Terra Vista, Defendant Campland, Defendant De Anza San Diego, and
28 Defendant De Anza were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents
issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are
therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS”
and/or “DEFENDANT.”

1 6. DEFENDANTS operate property management companies in California, including
2 in the county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

3 7. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from September of
4 2022 to June of 2024 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the
5 legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all
6 time worked.

7 8. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
8 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Terra Vista and/or
9 Defendant Campland and/or Defendant De Anza San Diego and/or Defendant De Anza in
10 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time
11 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
12 date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the
13 aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
14 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

26 10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
27 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
28 presently unknown to PLAINTIFFS who therefore sues these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious

1 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFFS will seek leave to amend this
2 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are
3 ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief
4 alleges, that the DEFENDANTS named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,
5 inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that
6 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

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

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

26 14. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
27 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANTS retained and continue to retain
28 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

15. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANTS in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by DEFENDANTS' past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

16. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

17. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS operate in locations across California, employ the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this County, and committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

THE CONDUCT

18. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal and rest premiums at the regular rate of pay, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members redeemed sick pay at the regular rate of pay, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and

1 the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage statements showing,
2 among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the
3 corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and
4 practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as
5 required by California law which allows DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair
6 advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to
7 toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANTS, the CLASS PERIOD should
8 be adjusted accordingly.

9 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

24 20. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
25 schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
27 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for

1 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
2 DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a
3 second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by
4 DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by
5 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and
6 narrowly construed “on-duty” meal period exception. When they were provided with meal
7 periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time,
8 required to remain on duty and on call. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required
9 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to maintain cordless communication
10 devices in order to receive and respond to work-related communications during what was
11 supposed to be their off-duty meal breaks. DEFENDANTS’ failure to provide PLAINTIFF and
12 the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by
13 DEFENDANTS’ business records. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and
14 DEFENDANTS’ inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA
15 CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
16 DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate policy and practice.

17 **B. Rest Period Violations**

18 21. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
20 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
21 DEFENDANTS’ inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
22 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
23 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some
24 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and
25 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
26 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. Further,
28 DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 Members to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-
2 related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest breaks. PLAINTIFF
3 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*
4 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing,
5 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time denied their
6 proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

7 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

19 23. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and
20 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal
21 cell phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools as a result of and in furtherance of their job
22 duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
23 use their personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools in order to perform work
24 related tasks. However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the use of their personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and
26 personal tools. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, the
27 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business
28 expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell

1 phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools, all on behalf of and for the benefit of
2 DEFENDANTS.

3 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

12 25. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for
14 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS
15 also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and
16 accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours
17 worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
18 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
19 meal and rest periods.

20 26. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the accurate name and
22 address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8). Further,
23 DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 Members with wage statements that provided all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
25 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in
26 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(9).

1 27. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide
2 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
3 Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).

4 28. As a result, DEFENDANTS issued PLAINTIFF and other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).
6 Further, DEFENDANTS' violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an
7 unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

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

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

12 30. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required
13 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
14 work, including but not limited to, opening and closing keyholder duties. This resulted in
15 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS having to work while off-the-
16 clock.

17 31. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-
18 the-clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

9 37. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
10 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control, and
11 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, opening and
12 closing keyholder duties. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF
13 and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in accordance with
14 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

15 **F. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**
16 **and Redeemed Sick Pay**

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

26 39. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
27 their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
28

1 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
2 employee's performance.

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

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

27 42. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
28 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a

1 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
2 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
3 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed
4 sick pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain
5 an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
6 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members against DEFENDANTS, the
7 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

8 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

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

13 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

14 44. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
15 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of
16 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
18 and rest breaks. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and
19 unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and
20 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all
21 hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and
22 missed rest breaks.

23 45. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
24 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
25 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

26 46. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
27 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
28 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the

CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30) minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

47. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

I. Unlawful Rounding Practices

48. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice that resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

49. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' time being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding policy and practice caused PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to

perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break.

J. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages

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

51. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, “If an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.” Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, “his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.” PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or at the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202.

52. As such, PLAINTIFF demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not timely paying all wages due at time of termination for all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members whose employment ended during the CLASS PERIOD.

K. Sick Pay Violations

53. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that “An employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.” Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick leave. As of January 1, 2024, Defendants failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide and allow employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

1 54. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its
2 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.
3 From time to time, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish
4 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting forth
5 the amount of paid sick leave available.

6 55. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
7 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
8 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
9 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
10 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required
11 by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided
12 PLAINTIFF with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the
13 rest break. DEFENDANTS policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during
14 what was supposed to be his off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and
15 rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict
16 corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with
17 paystubs that failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANTS also failed
18 to reimburse PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the personal expenses
19 incurred for the use of their personal cell phone, personal vehicles and purchase of tools, on
20 behalf of and in furtherance of his employment with DEFENDANTS. To date, DEFENDANTS
21 have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed
22 to him or any penalty wages owed to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy
23 for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

24 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

25 56. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself, and a California class
26 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Terra Vista and/or
27 Defendant Campland and/or Defendant De Anza San Diego and/or Defendant De Anza in
28 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time

1 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
2 date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

3 57. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have uniformly been
4 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to
5 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,
6 illegal meal and rest period policies, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failed compensate
7 for off-the-clock work, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to maintain
8 required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and expenses.

9 58. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
10 impractical.

11 59. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANTS’ conduct, including
12 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to accurately
13 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately calculate the
14 regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failing to provide legally
15 compliant meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide
16 accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum
17 wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions
18 affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact
19 common to the class are:

- 20 a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
21 practices;
- 22 b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
23 practices;
- 24 c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
25 Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- 26 d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
27 Members accurate overtime wages;
- 28

- 1 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 3 f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- 5 g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 6 h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
7 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
8 CLASS for all time worked;
- 9 i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
10 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit
12 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
13 permit this work;
- 14 j. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the
15 UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

17 60. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
18 a result of DEFENDANTS' conduct and actions alleged herein.

19 61. PLAINTIFF's claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
20 PLAINTIFF has the same interests as the other members of the class.

21 62. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

23 63. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
24 litigation.

25 64. Further, PLAINTIFF's interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
26 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

27 65. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of
28 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANTS are

1 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
2 sustained.

3 66. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
4 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual
5 issues relating to liability and damages.

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

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

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

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

4 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

21 72. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have engaged and continue to
22 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
23 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
24 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and
25 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.
26 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
27 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

28 73. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS’ practices were unlawful and
unfair in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive
unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or
utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203

1 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully
2 withheld.

3 74. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were deceptive and
4 fraudulent in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
5 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and
6 rest periods, failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, and failed to reimburse all
7 necessary business expenses incurred, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be
8 justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission
9 requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should
10 issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including
11 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

12 75. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unlawful,
13 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
14 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
15 DEFENDANTS.

16 76. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and
17 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
18 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
19 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

20 77. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal
22 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for
23 each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10)
24 hours of work.

25 78. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was
27 not timely provided as required by law.
28

1 79. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
2 DEFENDANTS have obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
3 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and
4 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
5 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANTS so as to allow DEFENDANTS
6 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

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

12 81. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,
13 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
14 DEFENDANTS have acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
16 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

17 82. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
18 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair,
19 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANTS from
20 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

21 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain, speedy
22 and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of
23 DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a
24 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other
25 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal
26 and economic harm unless DEFENDANTS are restrained from continuing to engage in these
27 unlawful and unfair business practices.

28 ///

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

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

3

4

5
6
7

8
9
10
11

12
1314
15
1617
18

19
20
21
22
23

24
25
26
27

1 90. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
2 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
3 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANTS acted
4 in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of
5 the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable
6 laws and regulations.

7 91. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
8 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
9 minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANTS.

10 92. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
12 failure to pay all earned wages.

13 93. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
14 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true
15 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have
16 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown
17 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

18 94. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.
20 DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
21 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
22 and procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
23 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages
24 for their time worked.

25 95. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
26 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked
27 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANTS acted and continues to act
28 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the
2 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal
3 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
4 these employees.

5 96. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request
6 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
7 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANTS, in a sum as provided by the
8 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage
9 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have
10 terminated their employment, DEFENDANTS' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or
11 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab.
12 Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members. DEFENDANTS' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good
14 faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and
15 recover statutory costs.

16 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

18 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

19 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against ALL Defendants)**

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

23 98. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
24 for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the
25 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to pay these employees
26 for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday,
27 and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.
28

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

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

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

10 102. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
11 were required by DEFENDANTS to work for DEFENDANTS and were not paid for all the time
12 they worked, including overtime work.

13 103. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
14 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
15 implementing a uniform policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by
16 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to
17 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked,
18 including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
19 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

20 104. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
21 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
22 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal
23 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
24 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
25 regulations.

26 105. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
27 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
28 overtime compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANTS.

1 106. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
2 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to
3 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
4 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining
5 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather,
6 PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of himself and the CALIFORNIA CLASS based on
7 DEFENDANTS' violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
8 California.

9 107. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked than they were entitled to, constituting
11 a failure to pay all earned wages.

12 108. DEFENDANTS failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of
13 the CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
14 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, & 1198, even
15 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were regularly required
16 to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which DEFENDANTS
17 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records and
18 witnessed by employees.

19 109. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
20 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true
21 amount of overtime they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are
23 presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

24 110. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
25 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.
26 DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
27 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
28 procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay

1 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for
2 their overtime worked.

3 111. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
4 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked
5 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANTS acted and continue to act
6 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious of and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the
8 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal
9 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
10 these employees.

11 112. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
12 request recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
13 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANTS, in a sum as provided by the
14 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is
15 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their
16 employment, DEFENDANTS' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore
17 these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
18 penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANTS' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional,
19 and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are
20 entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

21 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

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

24 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

25 113. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
26 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
27 Complaint.
28

1 114. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to provide all the legally
2 required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members as
3 required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by
4 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members did not prevent these employees from being
5 relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their
6 rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often not
7 fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANTS for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANTS'
8 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required
9 meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
10 records. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were
12 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
13 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation
14 and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

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

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

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

4 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

8 118. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
9 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
10 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
11 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)
12 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and
13 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour
15 wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by
17 DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers. In addition, DEFENDANTS failed to
18 compensate PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as
19 required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANTS' failure to
20 provide PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid
21 rest periods is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

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

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

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements

(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)

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

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

122. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- a. Gross wages earned,
- b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
- c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and

- i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

123. When DEFENDANTS did not accurately record PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

124. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the accurate name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8). Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(9).

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

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

1 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
2 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
3 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
4 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

5 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

7 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

8 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

12 128. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

13 As used in this article:

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

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

23 130. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

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

132. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

133. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members terminated, and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of wages to these employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

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

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)

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

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

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

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

137. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANTS' benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of their personal cell

1 phones, personal vehicles, and personal tools all on behalf of and for the benefit of
2 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
3 required by DEFENDANTS to use their personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and personal
4 tools to execute their essential job duties on behalf of DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS' uniform
5 policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 members for expenses resulting from the use of their personal cell phones, personal vehicles, and
7 personal tools within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANTS. These
8 expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANTS are estopped by
9 DEFENDANTS' conduct to assert any waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses were
10 necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members,
11 DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
12 members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of
13 California.

14 138. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred
15 by him and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties for
16 DEFENDANTS, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANTS, with interest at the
17 statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

21 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 22 a. That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
24 b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
25 DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
26 c. An order requiring DEFENDANTS to pay all overtime wages and all sums
27 unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members
28 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and

d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANTS' ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANTS' violations due to PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

3. On all claims:

- a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and

///

///

1 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
2 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, § 246 and/or
3 § 1194.

4
5 DATED: August 16, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

6
7 By: 

Shani Zakay

Attorney for PLAINTIFF

8
9
10
11 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

12 PLAINTIFFS demands a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

13
14 DATED: August 16, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

15
16 By: 

Shani Zakay

Attorney for PLAINTIFF