

SUMMONS

(CITACION JUDICIAL)

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

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

UBER FREIGHT US LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; UBER FREIGHT LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

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

VINCENT CORENO, an individual, on behalf of himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
3/14/2024 9:58 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Tarasyuk, 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): Los Angeles Superior Court of California

Stanley Mosk Courthouse, 111 North Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

24STCV06459

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: David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court Clerk, by _____, Deputy
(Fecha) 03/14/2024 (Secretario) Y. Tarasyuk (Adjunto)

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

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

[SEAL]

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

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

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
julieann@zakaylaw.com
rachel@zakaylaw.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
3/14/2024 9:58 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Tarasyuk, Deputy Clerk

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 LOS ANGELES

VINCENT CORENO, an individual, on behalf
of himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UBER FREIGHT US LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company; UBER FREIGHT LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; UBER
TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware
corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: **24STCV06459**

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:

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

1 PLAINTIFF VINCENT CORENO (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, in his representative
2 capacity on behalf of the State of California and fellow Aggrieved Employees, acting as a private
3 attorney general under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.*
4 (“PAGA”) only, alleges on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which
5 are based on personal knowledge, the following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against UBER FREIGHT US LLC, LLC, UBER
8 FREIGHT LLC, and UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. (“DEFENDANT” and/or
9 “DEFENDANTS”) seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties for himself, and on behalf of all
10 current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not**
11 **seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.**

12 To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not
13 seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations in this action, but simply the
14 civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699. Notwithstanding, PLAINTIFF is not
15 abandoning his right to pursue his individual claims for, *inter alia*, Defendant’s alleged wage
16 violations, and/or general or special damages arising from those violations, and she fully intends
17 to, at a future date, pursue claims for those individual claims and damages.

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

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

25 **THE PARTIES**

26 4. Defendant UBER FREIGHT US LLC (“Defendant Uber Freight US”) is a
27 Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and
28 continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

1 5. Defendant UBER FREIGHT LLC (“Defendant Uber Freight”) is a Delaware
2 limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to
3 conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4 6. Defendant UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. (“Defendant Uber Technologies”) is a
5 Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to
6 conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

7 7. Defendant Uber Freight US, Defendant Uber Freight, and Defendant Uber
8 Technologies were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to
9 PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are therefore
10 jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or
11 “DEFENDANT.”

12 8. DEFENDANTS own and operate a transportation business throughout the state of
13 California, including the county of Los Angeles, where PLAINTIFF worked.

14 9. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from May of 2021 to
15 August of 2023 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally
16 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
17 worked.

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

27 11. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting
28 on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the

1 agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct
2 alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein.
3 Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and all
4 Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED
5 EMPLOYEES, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants'
6 agents, servants and/or employees.

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

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

18 14. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
19 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
20 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to herself
21 and all non-exempt employees who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in
22 California (the "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of January 8, 2023 until
23 the present (the "PAGA PERIOD").

24 15. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of himself and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently
25 or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA Period, brings this representative
26 action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* seeking penalties for DEFENDANT'S violation of
27 California Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3
28 226.7, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198,

1 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, and the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon the foregoing,
2 PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees within the meaning
3 of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

7 17. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
8 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs
9 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES across California, including in this County, and committed the
10 wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

11 **THE CONDUCT**

12 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

27 19. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
28 schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other

1 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
2 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
3 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more
4 than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT
5 fails to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal
6 period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT to work ten
7 (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
8 EMPLOYEES does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed “on-duty” meal period
9 exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. DEFENDANT’s
11 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with legally required meal
12 breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
13 EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance
14 with DEFENDANT’s strict corporate policy and practice.

15 **B. Rest Period Violations**

16 20. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being
18 provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
19 DEFENDANT’s inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
20 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
21 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some
22 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and
23 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
24 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
25 EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. PLAINTIFF
26 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*
27 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT’s inadequate staffing,
28

1 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time denied their proper
2 rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

3 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

15 22. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
16 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to use their personal cell phones and their own Wi-Fi as a result of
17 and in furtherance of their job duties, including but not limited to receiving and/or responding to
18 work-related communications and performing work-related duties. However, DEFENDANT
19 unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the use
20 of their personal cell phones and their own Wi-Fi. As a result, in the course of their employment
21 with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred
22 unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of
23 their personal cell phones and their own Wi-Fi.

24 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

25 23. California Labor Code Section 226 required an employer to furnish its employees
26 and accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
27 worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions,
28 (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the

1 name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security number or an
2 employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of
3 the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
4 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

5 24. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
6 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed
7 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also failed
8 to provide PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage
9 statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours worked and
10 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
11 worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest
12 periods.

13 25. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
14 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements that comply with Cal.
15 Lab. Code § 226.

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

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

21 27. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
22 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all
23 hours worked.

24 28. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
25 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work. This
26 resulted in PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to have to work while off-the-
27 clock.
28

1 29. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
2 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

3 30. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
4 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED
5 EMPLOYEES.

6 31. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
7 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to document, track,
8 or pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages earned and owed for
9 all the work they performed.

10 32. PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were non-exempt
11 employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

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

17 34. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
18 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

19 35. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited
20 wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and benefit for the
21 time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to not pay
22 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in accordance with
23 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

26 36. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and continues
27 to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
28 for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed

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

7 37. 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 38. 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 39. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay
18 periods where PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked overtime, double
19 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
20 discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
21 compensation as part of the employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
22 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
23 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
24 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
25 EMPLOYEES must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in
26 a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
27 premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
28 EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates

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

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

16 **G. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

17 41. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
18 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment.
19 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time, did not receive payment
20 of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period
21 premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

22 42. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, "If an employer discharges an employee, the
23 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." Pursuant to
24 Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, "his or her wages shall become
25 due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours
26 previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her
27 wages at the time of quitting." PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from
28 time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or

1 at the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202.

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

5 **H. Unlawful Deductions**

6 44. DEFENDANT, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
7 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' pay without explanations and without authorization to do so
8 or notice to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. As a result, DEFENDANT
9 violated Labor Code § 221.

10 **I. Timekeeping Manipulation**

11 45. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT, from time-to-time, did not have an
12 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
13 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
14 EMPLOYEES worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal and rest
15 breaks. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally alter
16 the time recorded in DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and other
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in order to avoid paying these employees for all hours worked,
18 applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed rest
19 breaks.

20 46. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time-to-
21 time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without
22 compensation at the applicable pay rates.

23 47. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANT to alter
24 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANT's
25 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
26 EMPLOYEES clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees were
27 not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of
28

1 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
2 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

3 48. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited
4 wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT'S direction, control and benefit for the
5 time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice to
6 not pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in
7 accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT'S business records.

8 **J. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

21 50. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
22 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' time
23 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding
24 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work as
25 ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
26 duty meal break.

27 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

28 51. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that "An employee who, on or after

1 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from
2 the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”
3 Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From
4 time to time, DEFENDANT failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided PLAINTIFF
5 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with sick days and/or paid sick leave.

6 52. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its
7 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.
8 From time to time, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF
9 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements setting forth the amount of paid
10 sick leave available.

11 **L. Vested Vacation Time Violations**

12 53. Upon PLAINTIFF’s and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ separation of
13 employment, they had not used all of their vested vacation and thus their unused, vested vacation
14 was required to have been paid at their final rate upon separation of employment. DEFENDANT,
15 however failed to pay the vested vacation time, and when it did, it paid it at the wrong rate. As a
16 result, DEFENDANT violated Labor Code §227.3.

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

1 PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the use of his personal cell phone and
2 personal Wi-Fi, on behalf of and in furtherance of his employment with DEFENDANT. To date,
3 DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time
4 compensation still owed to them or any penalty wages owed to them under Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
5 The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of
6 \$75,000.

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

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

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

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

22 57. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
23 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
24 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to himself
25 and all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California during the time period of
26 January 8, 2023, until the present (the "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES").

27 58. On January 8, 2024, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by certified mail to the Labor
28 and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the specific provisions

1 of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See Exhibit #1,
2 attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting period for
3 Plaintiff to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section
4 2699.3, Plaintiff may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to
5 Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED
6 EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

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

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF pray for a judgment against each Defendant, jointly and
3 severally, as follows:

4 1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
5 EMPLOYEES:

6 a. Recovery of civil penalties as prescribe by the Labor Code Private Attorneys
7 General Act of 2004;

8 b. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law.
9

10 DATED: March 13, 2024

11 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

12 By: 

13 Shani O. Zakay

14 Attorney for PLAINTIFF
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Client #68601

January 8, 2024

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendants

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Online Filing

UBER FREIGHT US LLC

c/o C T Corporation System
330 N Brand Blvd, Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1466 9059 05

UBER FREIGHT LLC

c/o C T Corporation System
330 N Brand Blvd, Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0951 2767 97

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

c/o C T Corporation System
330 N Brand Blvd, Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1466 9058 37

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 VINCENT CORENO (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant UBER FREIGHT US LLC (“Defendant Uber Freight US”), Defendant UBER FREIGHT LLC (“Defendant Uber Freight”), and Defendant UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. (“Defendant Uber Technologies”) (hereinafter, collectively, “Defendants”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from May of 2021 to August of 2023, 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 Uber Freight US and/or Defendant Uber Freight and/or Defendant Uber Technologies 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 Statue 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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Shani O. Zakay', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

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
julieann@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 LOS ANGELES

VINCENT CORENO, an individual, on behalf
of himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UBER FREIGHT US LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company; UBER FREIGHT LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; UBER
TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware
corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
6) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
9) FAILURE TO PAY VACATION WAGES DUE.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF VINCENT CORENO (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

1. Defendant UBER FREIGHT US LLC (“Defendant Uber Freight US”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. Defendant UBER FREIGHT LLC (“Defendant Uber Freight”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

3. Defendant UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. (“Defendant Uber Technologies”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4. Defendant Uber Freight US, Defendant Uber Freight, and Defendant Uber Technologies 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 5. DEFENDANTS own and operate a transportation business throughout the state of
2 California, including the county of Los Angeles, where PLAINTIFF worked.

3 6. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from May of 2021 to
4 August of 2023 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally
5 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
6 worked.

7 7. 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 Uber Freight US and/or
9 Defendant Uber Freight and/or Defendant Uber Technologies in California and classified as non-
10 exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four
11 (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court
12 (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15. 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.

16. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs 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

17. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANT 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 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 rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS 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

1 worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices are intended to
2 purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California
3 law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors
4 who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted
6 accordingly.

7 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

22 19. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
23 schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
25 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for
27 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
28 DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second

1 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT
2 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed “on-
4 duty” meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call.
6 DEFENDANT’s failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with
7 legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records. PLAINTIFF and
8 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional
9 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’s strict corporate policy and practice.

10 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

25 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

26 21. DEFENDANT as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure,
27 intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF
28 and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses incurred by the

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence of discharging
2 their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers
3 are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their
4 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her
5 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence
6 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer,
7 even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
8 to be unlawful."

9 22. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to use their personal cell phones and their own Wi-Fi as a result
11 of and in furtherance of their job duties, including but not limited to receiving and/or responding
12 to work-related communications and performing work-related duties. However, DEFENDANT
13 unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the
14 use of their personal cell phones and their own Wi-Fi. As a result, in the course of their
15 employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
16 incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to
17 the use of their personal cell phones and their own Wi-Fi.

18 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

27 24. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for

1 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also
2 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and
3 accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours
4 worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
5 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
6 meal and rest periods.

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

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

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

15 27. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
16 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 for all hours worked.

18 28. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
19 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
20 work. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to
21 work while off-the-clock.

22 29. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
23 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

24 30. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
25 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

27 31. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to

1 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
2 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

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

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

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

21 36. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
22 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
24 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
25 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
26 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
27 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at
28

1 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
2 pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT’S business records.

3 37. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
4 their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
5 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
6 employee’s performance.

7 38. The second component of PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members’ compensation was DEFENDANTS’ non-discretionary incentive program that paid
9 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
10 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
11 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various
12 performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

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

1 pay” for purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the
2 underpayment of which is recoverable under Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or 204.

3 40. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
4 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
5 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
6 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
7 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed
8 sick pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain
9 an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
10 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members against DEFENDANT, the
11 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

12 **G. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

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

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

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

1
2 ///

3 **H. Unlawful Deductions**

4 44. DEFENDANT, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
5 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do
6 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result, DEFENDANT
7 violated Labor Code § 221.

8 **I. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

18 46. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
19 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
20 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

21 47. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANT to alter
22 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANT's
23 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees
25 were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of
26 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
27 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

28 48. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT’S direction, control and benefit
2 for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANT’S uniform policy and
3 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all
4 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT’S business
5 records.

6 **J. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

7 49. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in
8 place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day,
10 including overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding
11 policy and practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
12 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did
13 in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS’ timekeeping
14 system for PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying
15 these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for
16 overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from
17 time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being
18 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

19 50. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS’ timekeeping system and unlawful
20 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ time
21 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS’ unlawful rounding
22 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
23 as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an
24 off-duty meal break.

25 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

26 51. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that “An employee who, on or after
27 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from
28 the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”

1 Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From
2 time to time, DEFENDANT failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided PLAINTIFF
3 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick leave.

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

9 **L. Vested Vacation Time Violations**

10 53. Upon PLAINTIFF's and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' separation of
11 employment, they had not used all of their vested vacation and thus their unused, vested vacation
12 was required to have been paid at their final rate upon separation of employment. DEFENDANT,
13 however failed to pay the vested vacation time, and when it did, it paid it at the wrong rate. As a
14 result, DEFENDANT violated Labor Code §227.3.

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

1 DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time
2 compensation still owed to them or any penalty wages owed to them under Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
3 The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of
4 \$75,000.

5 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

6 55. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself, and a California class
7 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Uber Freight US
8 and/or Defendant Uber Freight and/or Defendant Uber Technologies in California and classified
9 as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period
10 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined
11 by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

18 57. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
19 impractical.

20 58. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANT’s conduct, including
21 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to
22 accurately calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately
23 calculate the regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failing to
24 provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to reimburse for business expenses,
25 failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid
26 at least minimum wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over
27 any questions affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law
28 and fact common to the class are:

- a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and practices;
- b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and practices;
- c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate overtime wages;
- e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to permit this work;
- j. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

59. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as a result of DEFENDANT’s conduct and actions alleged herein.

60. PLAINTIFF’S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

1 61. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

3 62. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
4 litigation.

5 63. Further, PLAINTIFF'S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
6 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

7 64. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of
8 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are
9 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
10 sustained.

11 65. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
12 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual
13 issues relating to liability and damages.

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

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

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

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 71. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
25 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
26 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
27 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and
28 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.
Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

15 74. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
16 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
17 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
18 DEFENDANT.

19 75. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
20 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
21 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
22 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

23 76. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal
25 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for
26 each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10)
27 hours of work.
28

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

4 ///

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

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

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

21 81. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
22 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair,
23 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from
24 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

25 82. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
26 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of
27 DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a
28 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other

1 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
2 legal and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to engage in these
3 unlawful and unfair business practices.

4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

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

11 84. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
12 for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the
13 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate
14 and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

17 86. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
18 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than
19 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

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

22 88. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
23 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
24 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
25 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

27 89. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
28 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of

1 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
2 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regard to minimum wage pay.

3 ///

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

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

13 92. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked than they were entitled to, constituting a
15 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

21 94. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
22 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.
23 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
24 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
25 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
26 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages
27 for their time worked.
28

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

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

20 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

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

27 98. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
28 for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the

1 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees
2 for all overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday,
3 and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 105. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
2 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
3 overtime compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

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

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

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

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

27 110. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.

1 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
2 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
3 procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
4 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages
5 for their overtime worked.

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

14 112. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 request recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
16 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
17 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is
18 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their
19 employment, DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and
20 therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code §
21 203, which penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful,
22 intentional, and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

5 113. 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.

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

23 115. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
24 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
25 who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one
26 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a
27 meal period was not provided.
28

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)

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

117. 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.

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

119. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one

1 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that
2 rest period was not provided.

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

6 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

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

14 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
15 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
16 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.

17 123. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab.
18 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
20 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, their personal cell phones and
22 their own Wi-Fi as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties, including but not limited to
23 receiving and/or responding to work-related communications and performing work-related
24 duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by
25 DEFENDANTS to use their personal cell phones and their own Wi-Fi to execute their essential
26 job duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and procedure
27 was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses
28 resulting from using their personal cell phones for DEFENDANT within the course and scope

1 of their employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their
2 principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver
3 of this expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF
4 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse
5 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is
6 required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

7 124. PLAINTIFF therefore demands reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred
8 by them and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties for
9 DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with interest at the
10 statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

11 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

13 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

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

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

- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

127. When DEFENDANT 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, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANT 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.

128. 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.

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

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

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Pay Wages When Due

(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)

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

130. 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.

131. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

As used in this article:

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

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

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

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

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

1 135. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

2 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with
3 Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
4 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.

5 136. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
6 terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who
7 missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

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

13 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **For Failure to Pay Vacation Wages**

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

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

19 139. At all relevant times, California Labor Code §227.3 provides for the following:

20 Unless otherwise Unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining
21 agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for
22 paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested
23 vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in
24 accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting
25 eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or
employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon
termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated representative, in the
resolution of any dispute with regard to vested vacation time, shall apply the
principles of equity and fairness.

26 140. At all times relevant, including at times throughout the four-year period preceding
27 the filing of the original complaint, PLAINTIFF, and upon information and belief, and
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were subject to an employer policy and/or contract of

1 employment that provided for paid vacations not otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining
2 agreement. Upon PLAINTIFF's and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' separation of
3 employment, they had not used all of their vested vacation and thus their unused, vested vacation
4 was required to have been paid at their final rate upon separation of employment. As a result of
5 the miscalculation, Defendants violated Labor Code §227.3.

6 141. PLAINTIFF seeks, on his behalf and on behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, all
7 damages and remedies available under California Labor Code §227.3, including payment of the
8 vacation wages at the final rate.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF pray for a judgment against each Defendant, jointly and
11 severally, as follows:

12 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

23 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 24 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and
25 Ninth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action
26 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
27 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
28 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of

- 1 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest
2 thereon at the statutory rate;
- 3 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
4 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 5 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in
6 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding
8 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for
9 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226
- 10 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
11 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
12 therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 13 f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.

15 ///

16

17 ///

18

19 ///

20

21 ///

22

23 ///

24

25 ///

26

27 ///

28

1 3. On all claims:

- 2 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 3 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- 4 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
- 5 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, and/or § 1194.
- 6

7 DATED: January 8, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

9 By: 
10 Shani O. Zakay
11 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

12

13 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

15

16 DATED: January 8, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

17

18 By: 
19 Shani O. Zakay
20 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

9589 0710 5270 1466 9059 37

**U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT**
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

Certified Mail Fee \$	Postmark Here
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)	
☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$	
☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$	
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$	
☐ Adult Signature Required \$	
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$	
Postage \$	
Total Postage and Fees \$	
Sent To uber Technologies, Inc.	
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.	
City, State, ZIP+4®	
PS Form 3800, January 2023 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions	

9589 0710 5270 0951 2767 97

**U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT**
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

Certified Mail Fee \$	Postmark Here
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)	
☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$	
☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$	
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$	
☐ Adult Signature Required \$	
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$	
Postage \$	
Total Postage and Fees \$	
Sent To uber Freight LLC	
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.	
City, State, ZIP+4®	
PS Form 3800, January 2023 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions	

9589 0710 5270 1466 9059 05

**U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT**
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

Certified Mail Fee \$	Postmark Here
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)	
☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$	
☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$	
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$	
☐ Adult Signature Required \$	
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$	
Postage \$	
Total Postage and Fees \$	
Sent To c/o CT Corp. System Uber Freight US LLC	
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.	
City, State, ZIP+4®	
PS Form 3800, January 2023 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions	

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

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

1. Article Addressed to:

Uber Freight LLC
c/o GT Corporation System
330 N Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203



9590 9402 8151 3030 1455 95

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

589 0710 5270 0951 2767 97

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

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

NDS

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ YesIf YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

JAN 16 2024

002-551

coreho

1/8

Delivery Service

3. Service Type **

☐ Adult Signature☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery☐ Certified Mail®☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery☐ Insured MailInsured Mail Restricted Delivery
over \$500)☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted
Delivery☐ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation™

Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

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

1. Article Addressed to:

uber technologies, Inc.
c/o CT corporation System
330 N Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203



9590 9402 8151 3030 1456 01

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9 0710 5270 1466 9058 37

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

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

- ☐ Agent
☐ Address

B. Received by (Printed Name)

MDS

C. Date of Delivery

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

118

JAN 16 2024

002-551

coreno

Delivery Service

3. Service Type

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

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
☐ Registered Mail™
☐ Registered Mail Restr
Delivery
☐ Signature Confirmatic
☐ Signature Confirmatic
Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Rece