

February 5, 2024

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified/Electronic Mail to Defendants

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Online Filing

**HILTON GRAND VACATIONS
COMPANY, LLC**

c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Sacramento, CA 95833

***Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt
No. 9589 0710 5270 0951 5264 65***

**HILTON RESORTS CORPORATION dba
HILTON GRAND VACATIONS**

c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Sacramento, CA 95833

***Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt
No. 9589 0710 5270 0951 5264 72***

**HILTON GRAND VACATIONS CLUB,
LLC**

c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Sacramento, CA 95833

***Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt
No. 9589 0710 5270 0951 5286 74***

**HILTON GRAND VACATIONS CLUB,
LLC**

c/o Corporation Service Company
251 Little Falls Drive
Wilmington, DE 19808

***Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt
No. 9589 0710 5270 0951 5286 81***

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 SIXTO ALEGRIA FERNANDEZ (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant HILTON GRAND VACATIONS COMPANY, LLC (“Defendant Hilton Grand Vacations”), Defendant HILTON RESORTS CORPORATION dba HILTON GRAND VACATION (“Defendant Hilton Resorts”), and Defendant HILTON GRAND VACATIONS CLUB, LLC (“Defendant Hilton Grands Vacations Club”) (hereinafter collectively hereinafter “Defendants”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from March of 2023 to June 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 Defendants 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.

Very truly yours,
JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

SIXTO ALEGRIA FERNANDEZ, an
individual, on behalf of himself, and on behalf
of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HILTON GRAND VACATIONS COMPANY,
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,
HILTON RESORTS CORPORATION dba
HILTON GRAND VACATIONS, a Delaware
stock corporation, HILTON GRAND
VACATIONS CLUB, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

14 1. Defendant HILTON GRAND VACATIONS COMPANY, LLC (“DEFENDANT
15 HILTON GRAND VACATIONS COMPANY”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at
16 all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular
17 business throughout California.

18 2. Defendant HILTON RESORTS CORPORATION dba HILTON GRAND
19 VACATIONS (“DEFENDANT HILTON RESORTS”) is a Delaware stock company that at all
20 relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular
21 business throughout California.

22 3. Defendant HILTON GRAND VACATIONS CLUB, LLC (“DEFENDANT
23 HILTON GRAND VACATIONS CLUB”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all
24 relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular
25 business throughout California.

26 4. Defendant HILTON GRAND VACATIONS COMPANY, Defendant HILTON
27 RESORTS CORPORATION, and Defendant HILTON GRAND VACATIONS CLUB were the
28 joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the

1 company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as
2 employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

3 5. DEFENDANTS own and operate hotels throughout the world, including hotels in
4 the state of California, including the county of Riverside, where PLAINTIFF worked.

5 6. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from March 2023 to
6 October 2023 as a non-exempt employee, paid an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required
7 meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

8 7. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
9 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS in California and
10 classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period
11 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined
12 by the Court (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 DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and practice which failed to
17 lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANTS’ uniform policy and practice alleged
18 herein was an unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANTS retained
19 and continue to retain wages due to 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 DEFENDANTS in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
22 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by
23 DEFENDANTS’ 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. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
26 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANTS 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 DEFENDANTS in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by DEFENDANTS' past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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 DEFENDANTS 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 DEFENDANTS operate in locations across California, employ the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this County, and committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

THE CONDUCT

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 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal 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

1 periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT's
2 uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment
3 for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit
4 and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable
5 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS
6 PERIOD should be adjusted 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. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' 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 Further, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
7 maintain cordless communication devices on them during meal periods in order to receive and
8 respond to work-related communications. DEFENDANT’s failure to provide PLAINTIFF and
9 the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by
10 DEFENDANT’s business records. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
12 DEFENDANT’s strict corporate policy and practice.

13 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

1 CLASS Members were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and
2 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 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses incurred by the
7 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence of discharging
8 their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers
9 are 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 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
17 phones and the maintenance of their work uniform as a result of and in furtherance of their job
18 duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
19 use their personal cell phones in order to perform work related tasks. PLAINTIFF and other
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to clean and maintain their work uniforms.
21 However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS Members for the use of their personal cell phones and the maintenance of their work
23 uniform. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and
24 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included,
25 but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones and the maintenance
26 of their work uniform all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

27
28 ///

1 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

10 24. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for
12 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS
13 also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and
14 accurate wage statements which failed to show the complete requirements under California Labor
15 Code sections 226(a)(1)-(9), including but not limited to, all deductions, the total hours worked
16 and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of
17 time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest
18 periods.

19 25. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF
20 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members that failed to include applicable hourly rates in effect
21 during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the
22 employee, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(9).

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

26 27. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,
28

1 DEFENDANT's violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional
2 payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

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

4 28. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
5 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 for all hours worked.

7 29. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
8 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
9 work. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS having to
10 work while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the
11 undercompensated off-the-clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS Members.

13 30. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
14 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

38. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly

1 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
2 DEFENDANTS.

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

21 40. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
22 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
23 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
24 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
25 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay.
26 This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment
27 of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
28 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an

1 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
2 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANT, the
3 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

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

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

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

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

21 **H. Unlawful Deductions**

22 44. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
23 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ pay without explanations and without authorization to do
24 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
25 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

26 **I. Timekeeping Manipulation**

27 45. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT, from time-to-time, did not have an
28 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of

1 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
3 and rest breaks. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and
4 unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all
6 hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and
7 missed rest breaks.

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

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

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

24 **J. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

25 49. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in
26 place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day,
28 including overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding

1 policy and practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
2 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did
3 in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping
4 system for PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying
5 these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for
6 overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from
7 time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being
8 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

9 50. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
10 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' time
11 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful rounding
12 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
13 as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an
14 off-duty meal break.

15 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

16 51. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that "An employee who, on or after
17 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the
18 commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section." Further,
19 Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From time to
20 time, DEFENDANT failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided PLAINTIFF and other
21 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick leave.

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

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

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

17 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18 54. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of himself, and a California class
19 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and
20 classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period
21 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined
22 by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD").

23 55. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have uniformly been
24 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to
25 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,
26 illegal meal and rest period policies, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failed compensate
27 for off-the-clock work, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to maintain
28 required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and expenses.

1 56. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
2 impractical.

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

- 12 a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
13 practices;
- 14 b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
15 practices;
- 16 c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- 18 d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 Members accurate overtime wages;
- 20 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 22 f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- 24 g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 25 h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
26 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS for all time worked;

28 ///

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

9 58. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
10 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

11 59. PLAINTIFF'S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
12 PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

13 60. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

15 61. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
16 litigation.

17 62. Further, PLAINTIFF'S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
18 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

23 64. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
24 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual
25 issues relating to liability and damages.

26 65. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
27 adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all class members is impractical. Moreover,
28 since the damages suffered by individual members of the class may be relatively small, the

1 expense and burden of individual litigation makes it practically impossible for the members of the
2 class individually to redress the wrongs done to them. Without class certification and
3 determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory, and other legal questions within the class
4 format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
5 create the risk of:

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

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

16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

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

70. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 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.

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

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

73. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful, unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the

1 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
2 DEFENDANT.

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

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

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

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

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

26 79. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,
27 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
28 DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
2 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

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

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

14 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

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

21 83. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
22 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
23 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay
24 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

27
28 ///

1 85. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
2 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than
3 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

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

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

11 88. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
12 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
13 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
14 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regard to minimum wage pay.

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

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

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

27 92. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
28 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the true

1 time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have
2 suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown
3 to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

19 95. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request
20 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
21 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
22 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage
23 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have
24 terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or
25 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab.
26 Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS
27 Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good
28

1 faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and
2 recover statutory costs.

3 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

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

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

15 98. 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 99. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed
18 more than eight (8) hours per workday and/or more than forty (40) hours per workweek unless
19 they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

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

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

27 102. 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 failed to accurately record overtime worked by
2 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to
3 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked,
4 including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
5 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

23 106. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked than they were entitled to, constituting
25 a failure to pay all earned wages.

26 107. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
28 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, & 1198, even

1 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were regularly required
2 to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which DEFENDANT
3 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
4 witnessed by employees.

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

10 109. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
11 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.
12 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
13 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
14 procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF
15 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for their
16 overtime worked.

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

25 111. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 request recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
27 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
28 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is

1 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their
2 employment, DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore
3 these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
4 penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional,
5 and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are
6 entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

7 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

28 ///

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

115. 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)

116. 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.

117. 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

1 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid rest
2 periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

11 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Failure To Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

13 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

15 120. 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.

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

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

22 122. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab.
23 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
25 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members
26 for expenses which included, but were not limited to, personal expenses incurred for the use of
27 their personal cell phone and the maintenance of their work uniform, all on behalf of and for the
28 benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other

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

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

16 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

18 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

23 125. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
24 "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

- 25 a. Gross wages earned,
- 26 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
- 27 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
- 28

overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,

- c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

126. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show the complete requirements under California Labor Code sections 226(a)(1)-(9), including but not limited to, all deductions, 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, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

127. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members that failed to include applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(9).

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(a)(1)-(9).

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.

///

1 CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;

2 b. An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
3 DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;

4 c. An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all overtime wages and all sums
5 unlawfully withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members
6 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and

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

10 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

11 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth
12 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant
13 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;

14 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
15 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of
16 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest
17 thereon at the statutory rate;

18 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
19 the applicable IWC Wage Order;

20 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in
21 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding
23 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for
24 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;

25 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
26 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
27 therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

28 f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA

1 CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.

2 g. For all exemplary damages, according to proof, which were sustained as a result of
3 DEFENDANT's conduct.

4 h. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate.

5 i. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

6 j. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law.

7 3. On all claims:


8 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;

9 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and

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

12
13 DATED: February __, 2024

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

14
15 By: 

16 Jean-Claude Lapuyade
17 Attorney for PLAINTIFF
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: February __, 2024

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: 

Jean-Claude Lapuyade
Attorney for PLAINTIFF