

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

7-ELEVEN, INC., a Texas corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

CRYSTAL JOURDEN, an individual, on behalf of the State of California,
as a private attorney general,

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

12/27/2023 at 12:49:29 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Andrea Naranjo, Deputy Clerk

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

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.

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

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

Superior Court of California - San Diego - Hall of Justice Courthouse
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101

CASE NUMBER: 37-2023-00055846-CU-OE-CTL
(Número del Caso):

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Shani O. Zakay, Esq. SBN:277924 Tel: (619) 255-9047 Fax: (858) 404-9203
Zakay Law Group, APLC - 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE: 12/28/2023
(Fecha)

Clerk, by _____, Deputy
(Secretario) A. Naranjo (Adjunto)

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

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

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

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

under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation)	☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)
☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)	☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)	☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
☐ other (specify):	
4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
Rachel Newman (State Bar #350826)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
julieann@zakaylaw.com
rachel@zakaylaw.com

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

CRYSTAL JOURDEN, an individual, on behalf
of the State of California, as a private attorney
general,

Plaintiff,

v.

7-ELEVEN, INC., a Texas corporation; and
DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

37-2023-00055846-CU-OE-CTL

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

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

PLAINTIFF CRYSTAL JOURDEN (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, in her representative capacity on behalf of herself, the State of California, and fellow current and former AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, defined *infra*, against Defendant 7-ELEVEN, INC. (“DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANTS”), alleges on information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

INTRODUCTION

1. PLAINTIFF brings this representative action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) on behalf of other current and former aggrieved employees of DEFENDANT for engaging in a pattern and practice of wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code and seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties for herself, and on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees who worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699**. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

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

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

4. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT decreased their employment-related costs by systematically violating California wage and hour laws.

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

a. Failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods;

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

6. PLAINTIFF brings this representative action against DEFENDANT on behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees of DEFENDANT in California seeking all civil penalties and unpaid wages permitted pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

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

THE PARTIES

8. Defendant 7-ELEVEN, INC. is a Texas corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the state of California.

9. DEFENDANT operates convenience stores throughout the state of California, including in the County of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

10. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from April of 2020 to May of 2023 a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

11. PLAINTIFF brings this action in her representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and on behalf of all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified as non-exempt employees (hereinafter “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of October 19, 2022, until a date as determined by the Court (“PAGA PERIOD”).

12. PLAINTIFF is an “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE” within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c) because she was employed by DEFENDANT and suffered one or more of the alleged Labor Code violations committed by DEFENDANT.

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

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

15. 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.

16. 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

17. 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).)

18. 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

1 provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commissions shall
2 be subject to a civil penalty...” (*Lab. Code* § 558(a).).

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

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

13 21. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANTS, and each
14 of them, are subject to civil penalties for their failure to pay PLAINTIFF and the aggrieved employees
15 the appropriate wages as complained of herein and proximately caused the complaints, injuries, and
16 damages alleged herein.

17 22. At all relevant times, each Defendant, whether named or fictitious, was the agent,
18 employee or other person acting on behalf of each other Defendant, and, in participating in the acts
19 alleged in this Complaint, acted within the scope of such agency or employment and ratified the acts
20 of the other.

21 23. Each Defendant, whether named or fictitious, exercised control over PLAINTIFF’S
22 wages, working hours, and/or working conditions.

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

26
27
28 ///

1 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

6 26. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections
7 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANTS, and DEFENDANTS
8 (i) currently maintain and at all relevant times maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or
9 conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged
10 in this County against PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

11 **THE CONDUCT**

12 27. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements
13 of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company
14 policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally
15 compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
16 EMPLOYEES for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
17 EMPLOYEES for all time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF for off-the-clock work, failed to
18 pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES overtime at the correct regular rate of pay,
19 failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES meal and rest premiums at
20 the regular rate of pay, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES redeemed sick
21 pay at the regular rate of pay, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
22 for business expenses, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with
23 accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect
24 during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate.
25 DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and
26 full payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANTS to
27 illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent
28

equitable tolling operates to toll claims by AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against DEFENDANTS, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

A. Meal Period Violations

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

29. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are 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 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and the

1 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and
2 respond to work-related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal breaks.
3 DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with legally
4 required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records. As a result of their rigorous
5 work schedules and DEFENDANTS' inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
6 EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
7 DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

8 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

25 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

26 31. DEFENDANTS as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally,
27 knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF and the
28 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by the PLAINTIFF the

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

8 32. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and the
9 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal vehicle and for
10 the maintenance of their uniforms as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically,
11 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to use their personal vehicles and to
12 maintain their work uniforms. However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF
13 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the use of their personal vehicles and to maintain their work
14 uniforms. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, the PLAINTIFF and
15 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were
16 not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal vehicles and the maintenance of their work
17 uniforms, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

18 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

27 34. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
28 EMPLOYEES missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed meal and rest period

1 premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF
2 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to
3 show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in
4 effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct
5 rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods. Further, from time to time,
6 DEFENDANTS issued wage statements that failed to provide the accurate name and address of the
7 legal entity that employed PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of Cal. Lab.
8 Code § 226(a)(8).

9 35. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANTS, from time to time, failed to provide
10 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements that comply with Cal. Lab.
11 Code § 226.

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

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

17 37. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS failed and continues to
18 fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

19 38. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF
20 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including but not limited
21 to, assisting customers and other employees. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
22 EMPLOYEES having to work while off-the-clock.

23 39. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
24 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

25 40. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
26 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

27 41. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the
28 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to document, track, or

1 pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages earned and owed for all the work
2 they performed.

3 42. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were non-exempt employees, subject
4 to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

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

10 44. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF the AGGRIEVED
11 EMPLOYEES' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

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

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

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

28 47. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times their

1 “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were compensated at an
2 hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an employee’s performance.

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

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

26 50. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements
27 of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company
28 policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and

1 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct rate of pay for all overtime and double time worked,
2 meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay as required by California law which allowed
3 DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with
4 the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
5 against DEFENDANTS, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

6 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

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

11 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

12 52. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF and
13 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' pay without explanations and without authorization to do so or
14 notice to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. As a result, DEFENDANTS violated
15 Labor Code § 221.

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

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

27 55. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
28 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'

1 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
2 EMPLOYEES clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees were not at
3 all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of DEFENDANTS' uniform
4 policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30) minute off-duty meal breaks each
5 day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

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

11 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

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

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

2 59. 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 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

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

14 61. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees with
15 written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to time,
16 DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
17 EMPLOYEES with wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.

18
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 62. 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 63. 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 64. PLAINTIFF brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with
7 respect to herself and all other current and former AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES employed by
8 DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD.

9 65. At all relevant times, for the reasons described herein, and others, PLAINTIFF and the
10 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were aggrieved employees of DEFENDANT within the meaning of
11 Labor Code Section 2699(c).

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

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

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

25 69. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (f), PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
26 EMPLOYEES are entitled to civil penalties for DEFENDANTS' violations of Labor Code Section 201,
27 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558,
28 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14 1198, 1198.5, 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 EMPLOYEE [penalty per Labor Code Section 1174.5].

1 g. For violations of Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198,
2 1198.5 and 1199, a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100)
3 per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and
4 two hundred dollars fifty (\$250) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay
5 period for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section].

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

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

19
20
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

9 Dated: December 27, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,
ZAKAY LAW GROUP

11 By: 
12 Shani O. Zakay
13 Attorneys for PLAINTIFF
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1



Client #66101

October 19, 2023

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

7-ELEVEN, INC.

c/o Corporate Creations Network Inc.

5901 W. Century Blvd., #750

Los Angeles, CA 90045

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0842 0061 99

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Our offices represent Plaintiff CRYSTAL JOURDEN (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant 7-ELEVEN, INC. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant from April of 2020 to May of 2023, paid at times on an hourly basis and at times on a salary basis, classified as a non-exempt employee at all times during her employment, and entitled to payment of all wages and the legally required meal and rest breaks. Defendant, 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, Defendant failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for earned wages.

As a consequence of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her 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 in California during the relevant claim period.

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, 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 Defendant, 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, Defendant is on notice that Plaintiff continues her investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2695, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other aggrieved employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees.

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

Sincerely,

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

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

CRYSTAL JOURDEN, an individual, on
behalf of herself, and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

7-ELEVEN, INC., a Texas corporation; and
DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

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

10 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

11 PLAINTIFF CRYSTAL JOURDEN (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself
12 and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief,
13 except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

14 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

15 1. Defendant 7-ELEVEN, INC. (“DEFENDANT and/or DEFENDANTS”) is a
16 Texas corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct
17 substantial and regular business throughout California.

18 2. DEFENDANT operates convenience stores throughout the state of California,
19 including in the county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

20 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from April of 2020
21 to May of 2023, who was paid at times on an hourly basis and at times on a salary basis, classified
22 as a non-exempt employee at all times during her employment, and entitled to the legally required
23 meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

24 4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
25 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and
26 classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period
27 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined
28 by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the
CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a CALIFORNIA
CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during

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

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

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

27 8. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers or persons acting on behalf of the
28 PLAINTIFF'S employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or

1 caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision
2 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as
3 such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558,
4 at all relevant times.

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

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

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

18 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

27
28 ///

THE CONDUCT

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

A. Meal Period Violations

15. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT’s control. Specifically, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be

1 PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not
2 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
3 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
4 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
5 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
7 records.

8 16. Further, pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
9 DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members for all their
10 time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer,
11 including all the time the employee suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT required
12 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS members to work without paying them for all the time
13 they were under the DEFENDANT's control. Specifically, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF
14 to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off duty meal break due
15 to PLAINTIFF's rigorous work schedule and DEFENDANT's understaffing. PLAINTIFF was
16 from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been
17 PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
19 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
20 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
22 records.

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

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

12 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

27
28 ///

1 **C. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

18 21. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
19 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
20 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

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

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

1 24. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
2 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
3 work, including but not limited to, assisting customers and other employees. This resulted in
4 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-
5 clock.

6 25. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
7 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

8 26. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
9 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

11 27. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
12 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
13 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
14 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

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

25 31. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and
27 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, time spent
28 assisting customers and other employees. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to not

1 pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in
2 accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

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

19 34. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid
21 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
22 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
23 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various
24 performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

25 35. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay
26 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked overtime, double
27 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
28 discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus

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

15 36. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
16 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
17 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
18 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
19 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay.
20 This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment
21 of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
22 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an
23 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
24 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANT, the
25 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

26 **F. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

27 37. DEFENDANT as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure,
28 intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF

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

10 38. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal vehicles
12 and for the maintenance of their uniforms. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
13 CLASS Members were required use their personal vehicles and to maintain their work uniforms.
14 However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
15 CLASS Members for the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal vehicles and the
16 maintenance of their uniforms. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT,
17 the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business
18 expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal vehicles
19 and the maintenance of their work uniforms, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

20 **G. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

21 39. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in
22 place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFFS and other
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including
24 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and
25 practice that resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
26 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did
27 in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping
28 system for PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying

1 these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for
2 overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from
3 time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being
4 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

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

11 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

12 41. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
13 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of
14 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
16 and rest breaks.

17 42. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally
18 alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and other
19 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all hours
20 worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed
21 rest break.

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

25 44. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
26 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
27 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 **J. Sick Pay Violations**

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

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

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

12 **K. Unlawful Deductions**

13 51. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
14 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ pay without explanations and without authorization to do
15 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
16 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

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

1 PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the use of her personal vehicle and the
2 maintenance of her work uniform, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802. To date, DEFENDANT
3 has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed
4 to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy
5 for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

6 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

7 53. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of herself, and a California class
8 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT and classified as
9 non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning
10 four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the
11 Court (the "CLASS PERIOD").

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Business Practices

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

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

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

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

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

69. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to engage in these
2 unlawful and unfair business practices.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 93. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
28 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked

1 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act
2 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the
4 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal
5 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
6 these employees.

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

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

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

25 96. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
26 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
27 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all
28

1 overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or
2 twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

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

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

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

28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24
25
26
27
28 ///

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

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

3

4

5
6
7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23
24
25
26

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

10 119. 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.

13 120. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

14 As used in this article:

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

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

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

25 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
26 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
27 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
28 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.

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

124. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

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

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

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements

(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)

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

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

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

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

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

129. 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. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8).

130. 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.

131. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)

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

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

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

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

134. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of their personal vehicles and the maintenance of their uniforms all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal vehicles and maintain their work uniforms to execute their essential job duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses resulting from the use of their personal vehicle and the maintenance of their work uniforms for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of this expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

1 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to
2 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

3 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 4 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth
5 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant
6 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 7 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
8 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of
9 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest
10 thereon at the statutory rate;
- 11 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
12 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 13 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in
14 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding
16 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for
17 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226
- 18 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
19 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
20 therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 21 f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.
- 23
24
25
26
27

28 ///

1 3. On all claims:

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

7 DATED: October 18, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

9 By: _____

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

11

12 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

14

15 DATED: October 18, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

17 By: _____

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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:

7-Eleven Inc. Network
c/o Corporate Creations Inc.
5901 W. Century Blvd., #750
Los Angeles, CA 90045



9590 9402 8150 3030 4582 69

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9 0710 5270 0842 0061 99

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

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

☒ *T. Chind*

☐ Agent

☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

T. Chind

C. Date of Delivery

10/23

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

002-539
Jourden

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