

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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
01/10/2024 at 02:42:00 PM
Clerk of the Superior Court
By Mariejo Guyot, 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 DEVIN MOORE

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

DEVIN MOORE, an individual, in his
representative capacity on behalf of the State of
California and fellow Aggrieved Employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HENLEY PACIFIC LA LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company; HENLEY PACIFIC
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
HENLEY PACIFIC RE LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company; HENLEY PACIFIC
SD LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
HENLEY PACIFIC SOUTH LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company; DEVON
INDUSTRIES, INC., an Oklahoma corporation;
JDL TECH USA LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2023-00047610-CU-OE-CTL

**FIRST AMENDED REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. VIOLATIONS OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT AT
LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *ET SEQ.*

1 Plaintiff DEVIN MOORE (“PLAINTIFF”) an individual, in his representative capacity on behalf
2 of the State of California and fellow current and former AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, defined *supra*,
3 against Defendants HENLEY PACIFIC LA LLC, HENLEY PACIFIC LLC, HENLEY PACIFIC RE
4 LLC, HENLEY PACIFIC SD LLC, HENLEY PACIFIC SOUTH LLC, DEVON INDUSTRIES, INC.,
5 and JDL TECH USA LLC, alleges on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge
6 which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. PLAINTIFF brings this representative action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General
9 Act of 2004, California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) on behalf of other current and former
10 aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS for engaging in a pattern and practice of wage and hour
11 violations under the California Labor Code.

12 2. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANTS
13 decreased their employment-related costs by systematically violating California wage and hour laws.

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

- 16 a. Failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods;
- 17 b. Failure to allow employees to take duty-free meal and rest periods;
- 18 c. Failure to pay all minimum, regular and overtime wages;
- 19 d. Failure to correctly calculate the regular rate of pay;
- 20 e. Failure to maintain true and accurate records;
- 21 f. Failure to reimburse employees for required expenses;
- 22 g. Failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- 23 h. Failure to timely pay wages due during, and upon termination of employment.

24 4. PLAINTIFF brings this representative action against DEFENDANT on behalf of all
25 current and former aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS in California seeking all civil penalties
26 and unpaid wages permitted pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

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

THE PARTIES

6. Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC LA LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific LA”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

7. Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

8. Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC RE LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific RE”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

9. Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC SD LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific SD”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

10. Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC SOUTH LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific South”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

11. Defendant DEVON INDUSTRIES, INC. (“Defendant Devon Industries”) is an Oklahoma corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

12. Defendant JDL TECH USA LLC (“Defendant JDL Tech”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

13. Defendant Henley Pacific LA, Defendant Henley Pacific, Defendant Henley Pacific RE, Defendant Henley Pacific SD, Defendant Henley Pacific South, Defendant Devon Industries and Defendant JDL Tech 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

1 jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or
2 “DEFENDANT.”

3 14. DEFENDANTS operate oil change and vehicle maintenance shops throughout the state
4 of California, including in the county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

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

8 16. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the
9 requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, bring
10 this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect all individuals who are or
11 previously were employed by Defendant Henley Pacific LA and/or Defendant Henley Pacific and/or
12 Defendant Henley Pacific RE and/or Defendant Henley Pacific SD and/or Defendant Henley Pacific
13 South and/or Defendant Devon Industries and/or Defendant JDL Tech in California and classified as
14 non-exempt employees (the “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of November 1,
15 2022 until the present (the “PAGA PERIOD”).

16 17. PLAINTIFF is an “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE” within the meaning of Labor Code §
17 2699(c) because he was employed by DEFENDANTS and suffered one or more of the alleged Labor
18 Code violations committed by DEFENDANTS.

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

22 19. Each of the fictitiously named defendants participated in the acts alleged in this
23 Complaint. The true names and capacities of the defendants named as DOES 1 THROUGH 50,
24 inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF. PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint, setting forth
25 the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named defendants when their true names are
26 ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitious
27 defendants have participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint.
28

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

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

JOINT EMPLOYER

22. The Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”), permits an aggrieved employee to enforce any provision of the California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty. (*Lab. Code* § 2699(a).)

23. Section 558 of the California Labor Code provides that “any employer *or other person* acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commissions shall be subject to a civil penalty...” (*Lab. Code* § 558(a).);

24. Section 1197.1 of the Labor Code provides that “[a]ny employer *or other person* acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty...” (*Lab. Code* § 1197.1(a).)

25. Interpreting Sections 558 and 1197.1 of the Labor Code, California courts have held that a corporate employer's owners, officers and directors, are subject to civil penalties for the employer's failure to pay appropriate wages to its employees, and, since liability under either 558 or 1197.1 does not depend on a finding of an alter ego, no alter ego allegations or findings are necessary. *Atempa v. Pedrazzani*, (2018) 27 Cal.App.5th 809; see generally *Ochoa-Hernandez v. Cjaders Food, Inc.* (2009 WL 1404694); *Thurman v. Bayshore Management, Inc.* (2017) 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1145-1146.

1 26. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANTS, and each
2 of them, are subject to civil penalties for their failure to pay PLAINTIFF and the aggrieved employees
3 the appropriate wages as complained of herein and proximately caused the complaints, injuries, and
4 damages alleged herein.

5 27. At all relevant times, each Defendant, whether named or fictitious, was the agent,
6 employee or other person acting on behalf of each other Defendant, and, in participating in the acts
7 alleged in this Complaint, acted within the scope of such agency or employment and ratified the acts
8 of the other.

9 28. Each Defendant, whether named or fictitious, exercised control over PLAINTIFF's
10 wages, working hours, and/or working conditions.

11 29. Each Defendant, whether named or fictitious, acted in all respects pertinent to this action
12 as the agent of the other DEFENDANTS, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy, and the
13 acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other DEFENDANT.

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

19 31. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections
20 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANTS, resides in this County,
21 and DEFENDANTS (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and facilities
22 in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful
23 conduct herein alleged in this County against PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

24 **THE CONDUCT**

25 32. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements
26 of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company
27 policy, practice and procedure, intentionally, knowingly and systematically failed to provide legally
28 compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFF and the other

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

12 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

34. From time-to-time during the PAGA PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work schedules, and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off-duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES does not qualify for limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

B. Rest Period Violations

35. From time-to-time during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work schedule, being required to take orders, receive payments, expedite services, provide janitorial services, and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on DEFENDANTS' premises, on duty and/or on call. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one-hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and
2 DEFENDANTS' managers.

3 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

14 37. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other
15 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell phones and
16 personal protective equipment (PPE) as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically,
17 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to use their personal cell phones
18 and PPE in order to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to
19 reimburse PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the use of their personal cell phones
20 and PPE. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, the PLAINTIFF and
21 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were
22 not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones and PPE, all on behalf of and for the
23 benefit of DEFENDANT.

24 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 43. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and
23 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work while PLAINTIFF and other
24 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not clocked in. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other
25 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to have to work while off-the-clock.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 51. From time-to-time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail
24 to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for their
25 overtime hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the
26 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without
27 compensation at the correct overtime, meal and rest period premium, and sick pay rates.
28 DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES the correct

1 overtime rate for all overtime worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay in accordance with
2 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

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

6 53. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES'
7 compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF and
8 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incentive wages based on their performance for DEFENDANTS.
9 The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly basis with bonus
10 compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

11 54. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay periods
12 where PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked overtime, double time, paid meal
13 and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-discretionary bonuses,
14 DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus compensation as part of the
15 employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked rather than just all non-overtime
16 hours worked. Management and supervisors described the incentive/bonus program to potential and
17 new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation
18 received by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be included in the "regular rate
19 of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time
20 compensation, meal and rest period premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and
21 other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section
22 246 mandates that paid sick time for non-exempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as
23 the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time,
24 whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as
25 articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay"
26 for purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of
27 which is recoverable under Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or 204.
28

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

9 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

10 56. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF and
11 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE’ pay without explanations and without authorization to do so or notice to
12 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. As a result, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code
13 § 221.

14 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

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

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

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

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

10 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

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

28 ///

1 **J. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

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

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

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

18 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

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

25 67. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees with
26 written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to time,
27 DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF and other
28

1 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave
2 available.

3 Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take off duty meal and
4 rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods. PLAINTIFF was required
5 to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without
6 receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF with a second
7 off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours
8 of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to
9 remain on premises, on-duty and on-call for the rest break. DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF
10 to remain on premises, on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be his off-duty meal periods.
11 PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional compensation and in
12 accordance with DEFENDANT'S strict corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also
13 provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,
14 DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the use of his
15 personal cell phone and PPE, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802. To date, DEFENDANT has not
16 fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to him or any
17 penalty wages owed to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF
18 individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **For Civil Penalties Pursuant to Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA")**

21 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, et seq.]**

22 **(By PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and Against All DEFENDANTS)**

23 68. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES reallege and incorporate by this
24 reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

25 69. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor laws
26 through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's labor law
27 enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally a law
28 enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The purpose of the

1 PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private
2 attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified
3 that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general
4 to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA
5 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

6 70. PLAINTIFF brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with
7 respect to all current and former AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES employed by Defendant Henley Pacific
8 LA and/or Defendant Henley Pacific and/or Defendant Henley Pacific RE and/or Defendant Henley
9 Pacific SD and/or Defendant Henley Pacific South and/or Defendant Devon Industries and/or
10 Defendant JDL Tech during the PAGA PERIOD.

11 71. At all relevant times, for the reasons described herein, and others, PLAINTIFF and the
12 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS within the meaning of
13 Labor Code Section 2699(c).

14 72. Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (g) authorize an AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, like
15 PLAINTIFF, on behalf of all current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil
16 penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code Section 2699.3

17 73. PLAINTIFF complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code
18 Section 2699.3. By certified letter, return receipt requested, dated November 1, 2023, PLAINTIFF
19 gave written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and to
20 DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including
21 the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. See Exhibit #1.

22 74. As of the date of this Complaint, more than sixty-five (65) days after serving the LWDA
23 with notice and amended notice of DEFENDANTS' violations, the LWDA has not provided any notice
24 by certified mail of its intent to investigate the DEFENDANTS' alleged violations as mandated by
25 Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(A). Accordingly, pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(A),
26 PLAINTIFF may commence and is authorized to pursue this cause of action.

27 75. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (f), PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
28 EMPLOYEES are entitled to civil penalties for DEFENDANTS' violations of Labor Code Section 201,

201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14 1198, 1199, 2802, and 2804 in the following amounts:

- a. For violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and 204, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 2699(f)(2)];
- b. For violations of Labor Code Section 226(a), a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for any initial violation and one thousand dollars for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 226.3];
- c. For violations of Labor Code Sections 204, a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for any initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 210];
- d. For violations of Labor Code Sections 226.7, 510 and 512, a civil penalty in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for the initial violation and hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 558];
- e. For violations of Labor Code Section 2269(a), a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 226.3];
- f. For violations of Labor Code Section 1174(d), a civil penalty in the amount of five hundred (\$500) dollars for per AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEE [penalty per Labor Code Section 1174.5].

2 g. For violations of Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198 and
3 1199, a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100)
4 per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial
5 violation and two hundred dollars fifty (\$250) per AGGRIEVED
6 EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation [penalty
7 per Labor Code Section].

8 76. For all provisions of the Labor Code for which civil penalty is not specifically provided,
9 Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendant a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each
10 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for
11 each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation. PLAINTIFF and the
12 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs in
13 connection with their claims for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(g)(1).

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

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANT as follows:

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

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

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

8 Dated: January 10, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,
ZAKAY LAW GROUP, A.P.L.C.

9
10 By: 
11 Shani Zakay
Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP

A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Client # 66301

November 1, 2023

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendants

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Online Filing

HENLEY PACIFIC LA LLC

HENLEY PACIFIC LLC

HENLEY PACIFIC RE LLC

HENLEY PACIFIC SD LLC

HENLEY PACIFIC SOUTH LLC

DEVON INDUSTRIES, INC.

JDL TECH USA LLC

c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service

2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Ste. 150N

Sacramento, CA 95883

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1466 9050 66

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 DEVIN MOORE (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC LA LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific LA”), Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific”), Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC RE LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific RE”), Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC SD LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific SD”), Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC SOUTH LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific South”), Defendant DEVON INDUSTRIES, INC. (“Defendant Devon Industries”), and Defendant JDL TECH USA LLC (“Defendant JDL Tech”) (hereinafter, collectively, “Defendants”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from July of 2023 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 Henley Pacific LA and/or Defendant Henley Pacific and/or Defendant Henley Pacific RE and/or Defendant Henley Pacific SD and/or Defendant Henley Pacific South and/or Defendant Devon Industries and/or Defendant JDL Tech 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,


Shani O. Zakay
Attorney at Law

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

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

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

DEVIN MOORE, an individual, on behalf of
himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HENLEY PACIFIC LA LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company; HENLEY PACIFIC
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
HENLEY PACIFIC RE LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company; HENLEY PACIFIC
SD LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
HENLEY PACIFIC SOUTH LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company; DEVON
INDUSTRIES, INC., an Oklahoma
corporation; JDL TECH USA 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
- 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
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
 - 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
 - 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF DEVIN MOORE (“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 HENLEY PACIFIC LA LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific LA”) 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 HENLEY PACIFIC LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific”) 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 HENLEY PACIFIC RE LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific RE”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4. Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC SD LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific SD”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

5. Defendant HENLEY PACIFIC SOUTH LLC (“Defendant Henley Pacific South”) is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

6. Defendant DEVON INDUSTRIES, INC. (“Defendant Devon Industries”) is an Oklahoma corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to

1 conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2 7. Defendant JDL TECH USA LLC (“Defendant JDL Tech”) is a Delaware limited
3 liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct
4 substantial and regular business throughout California.

5 8. Defendant Henley Pacific LA, Defendant Henley Pacific, Defendant Henley
6 Pacific RE, Defendant Henley Pacific SD, Defendant Henley Pacific South, Defendant Devon
7 Industries and Defendant JDL Tech were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the
8 documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for
9 respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as
10 “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

11 9. DEFENDANTS operate oil change and vehicle maintenance shops throughout the
12 state of California, including in the county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

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

17 11. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
18 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Henley Pacific LA
19 and/or Defendant Henley Pacific and/or Defendant Henley Pacific RE and/or Defendant Henley
20 Pacific SD and/or Defendant Henley Pacific South and/or Defendant Devon Industries and/or
21 Defendant JDL Tech in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this
23 Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”). The
24 amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under
25 five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

26 12. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during
28 the CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice which failed to

1 lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice alleged
2 herein was an unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANT retained
3 and continues to retain wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
5 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the
6 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by
7 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
8 relief.

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

18 14. The agents, servants and/or employees of the DEFENDANTS and each of them
19 acting on behalf of the DEFENDANTS acted within the course and scope of his, her or its
20 authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the DEFENDANTS, and personally
21 participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the DEFENDANTS with respect to the
22 conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each DEFENDANT are legally attributable to
23 the other DEFENDANTS and all DEFENDANTS are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF
24 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result
25 of the conduct of the DEFENDANTS' agents, servants and/or employees.

26 15. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers or persons acting on behalf of the
27 PLAINTIFF'S employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or
28 caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision

1 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as
2 such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558,
3 at all relevant times.

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

9 17. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
10 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continue to retain
11 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

22 20. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
23 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs
24 the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this County, and committed the
25 wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

26 **THE CONDUCT**

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

1 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically
2 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate
3 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest
4 periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
5 time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
8 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse
9 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue
10 to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage
11 statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
12 periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT's
13 uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment
14 for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit
15 and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable
16 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS
17 PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

18 **A. Meal Period Violations**

19 22. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
20 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
21 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
22 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
23 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work
24 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically,
25 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be
26 PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not
27 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their

1 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
2 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
4 records.

5 23. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
6 schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
8 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for
10 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
11 DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second
12 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT
13 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-
15 duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on premises, on
17 duty and on call. DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.
19 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks
20 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy
21 and practice.

22 **B. Rest Period Violations**

23 24. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
25 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
26 DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
27 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
28 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some

1 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and
2 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
3 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on premises, on duty and/or on call.
5 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour
6 wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate
7 staffing, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time denied
8 their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

9 **C. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

26 27. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
27 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
28 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

5 **D. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

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

9 30. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
10 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
11 work while PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were not clocked in.
12 This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work
13 while off-the-clock.

14 31. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
15 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

16 32. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
17 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

25 35. DEFENDANT's policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed
27 for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than

1 eight (8) hours per day, DEFENDANT's policies and practices also deprived them of overtime
2 pay.

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

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

11 **E. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**
12 **and Redeemed Sick Pay**

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

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

27 40. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
2 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
3 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various
4 performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

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

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

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

6 **F. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

18 44. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
20 phones and personal protective equipment (PPE). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to use their personal cell phones and PPE.
22 However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
23 CLASS Members for the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phones and
24 PPE. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and
25 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included,
26 but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones and PPE, all on behalf
27 of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

28 ///

1 **G. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

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

20 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

21 47. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
22 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of
23 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
25 and rest breaks.

26 48. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally
27 alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all hours

1 worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed
2 rest break.

3 49. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
4 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
5 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

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

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

19 **I. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

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

25 53. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, "If an employer discharges an employee, the
26 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." Pursuant to
27 Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, "his or her wages shall become
28 due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours

1 previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her
2 wages at the time of quitting.” PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from
3 time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or
4 at the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202.

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

8 **J. Sick Pay Violations**

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

16 56. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its
17 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.
18 From time to time, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish
19 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting
20 forth the amount of paid sick leave available.

21 **K. Unlawful Deductions**

22 57. 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 58. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
27 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
28 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)

1 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
2 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required
3 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF
4 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on premises, on-duty and on-call for the
5 rest break. DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on premises, on-call and on-duty
6 during what was supposed to be his off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal
7 and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT'S strict
8 corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs
9 that failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT failed to reimburse
10 PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the use of his personal cell phone and PPE,
11 in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802. To date, DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the
12 minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to him or any penalty wages owed
13 to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does
14 not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

15 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

16 59. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of himself, and a California class
17 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Henley Pacific LA
18 and/or Defendant Henley Pacific and/or Defendant Henley Pacific RE and/or Defendant Henley
19 Pacific SD and/or Defendant Henley Pacific South and/or Defendant Devon Industries and/or
20 Defendant JDL Tech and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at
21 any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending
22 on the date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD").

23 60. 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 compensate for off-the-clock work, failure to provide
27 accurate itemized wage statements, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failure to maintain
28 required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and expenses.

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

3 62. 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, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements accurate,
8 failed to reimburse for business expenses, 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 63. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
10 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

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

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

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

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

19 68. 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 69. 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 70. 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 71. 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 72. 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 73. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.
24 Code § 17021.

25 74. 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).

75. 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.

76. 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.

77. 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, and failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

16 87. 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 88. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
20 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
21 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay
22 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

25 90. Cal. Lab. Code § 1197 provides the minimum wage for employees fixed by the
26 commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than
27 the minimum so fixed is unlawful.
28

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

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

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

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

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

21 96. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
23 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

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

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

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

27
28 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

5 101. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

25 107. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
26 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
27 implementing a uniform policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by
28 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to

1 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked,
2 including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
3 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

10 109. 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 overtime compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

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

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

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

1 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
2 witnessed by employees.

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

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

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

23 116. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 request recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
25 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
26 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is
27 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their
28 employment, DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore

1 these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
2 penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional,
3 and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are
4 entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

7 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

26 119. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
27 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
28 who were not provided a meal 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 a
2 meal 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 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

27 123. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
28 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members

1 who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one
2 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that rest
3 period was not provided.

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

7 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

11 125. 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.

14 126. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

15 As used in this article:

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

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

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

26 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
27 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
28 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.

///

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

3 130. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

4 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with
5 Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
6 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.

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

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

15 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

17 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

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

- 24 a. Gross wages earned,
- 25 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
- 26 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
- 27 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
- 28 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.

135. 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.

136. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT 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.

137. 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

1 wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not
2 properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
3 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover
4 liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation
5 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
6 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
7 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
8 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

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

17 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
18 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
19 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.

20 140. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab.
21 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
23 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of their personal cell
25 phones and PPE, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically, PLAINTIFF
26 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use their
27 personal cell phones and PPE to execute their essential job duties on behalf of DEFENDANT.
28 DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and

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

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

13 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

16 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

27 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 28 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth

Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;

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

3. On all claims:

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

DATED: November 1, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: _____


Shani O. Zakay, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: November 1, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1

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:

Henley Pacific LLC
c/o G&G-Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr., Ste. 150N
Sacramento, CA 95883



9590 9402 8150 3030 4584 05

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9 0710 5270 1466 9050 66

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)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? If YES, enter delivery address below.

☐ Yes

☒ No

002-558

Moore 11/11

3. Service Type

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

☐ Priority Mail Express®

☐ Registered Mail™

☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation™

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

EXHIBIT