

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

Victoria B. Rivapalacio (State Bar #275115)

victoria@bamlawca.com

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ERIC GONZALEZ, an individual, on behalf
of himself and on behalf of all persons
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DART CONTAINER CORPORATION OF
CALIFORNIA, a corporation; DART
CONTAINER CORPORATION; and DOES
1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. **CVRI2503315**

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200;
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;
4. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
8. FAILURE TO PAY SICK PAY WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB CODE §§201-203, 233, 246;
9. VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR CODE §§ 2698, et seq.]

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

1 Eric Gonzalez ("PLAINTIFF"), an individual, on behalf of himself and all other similarly
2 situated current and former employees alleges on information and belief, except for his own acts and
3 knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following.

4
5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. Dart Container Corporation of California ("DEFENDANT") is a corporation that at all
7 relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

8 2. Dart Container Corporation ("DEFENDANT") is a corporation that
9 at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in
10 California.

11 3. Dart Container Corporation of California and Dart Container Corporation are the
12 joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by paycheck and by the company PLAINTIFF performed
13 work for respectively, and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein,
14 and are therefore collectively referred to herein as ("DEFENDANT").

15 4. DEFENDANT owns and operates food and beverage packaging manufacturing facilities
16 in California.

17 5. PLAINTIFF is currently employed by DEFENDANT in California. PLAINTIFF's
18 employment started in February of 2015. PLAINTIFF is at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a
19 non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods
20 and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

21 6. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class, defined
22 as all individuals who are or previously were employed by Dart Container Corporation of California
23 and/or Dart Container Corporation in California, including any employees staffed with Dart Container
24 Corporation of California and/or Dart Container Corporation by a third party, and classified as non-
25 exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning June 20,
26 2021 and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The
27 amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million
28 dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

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

THE CONDUCT

1 10. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
2 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
3 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all
4 the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they are under
6 DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while
7 clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was
8 from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been
9 PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and
10 procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by
11 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that
12 during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid
13 less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than
14 "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeit
15 minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their
16 time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's
17 policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time
18 worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

19 11. State and federal law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and
20 rest break premiums at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that is tied to
22 specific elements of an employee's performance.

23 12. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members'
24 compensation is DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF and
25 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their performance for
26 DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all employees paid on an hourly
27 basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
28 DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate of pay in order to pay overtime and

1 meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members,
2 DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate
3 of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay and meal and rest break premium pay.
4 Management and supervisors described the incentive program to potential and new employees as
5 part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by
6 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of
7 pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and
8 rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

9 13. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and
11 were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for
13 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT
14 from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second
15 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT
16 to work ten (10) hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal
17 period times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.
18 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without
19 additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

20 14. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS Members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without
22 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest
23 periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from
24 time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of
25 between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at
26 least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time.
27 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour
28 wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to

1 provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time
2 during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control.
3 In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and
4 permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties
5 and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the
6 locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that
7 prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes back. Here,
8 DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members from
9 unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which states PLAINTIFF and
10 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members cannot leave the work premises during their rest period.

11 15. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately
12 record and pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual amount of
13 time these employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
14 DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all
15 time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an
16 employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work.
17 DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the time
18 they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that
19 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all
20 time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited time
21 worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the
22 applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off the
23 clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT fails to pay minimum wages
24 for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

25 16. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed
27 to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides
28 that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage

1 statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly
2 rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly
3 rate. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the
4 wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours
5 worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor
6 Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage
8 statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours
9 shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked
10 during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed
11 above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement
12 that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from
13 time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage
14 statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

15 17. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
16 CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in violation of Cal. Lab.
17 Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt employees earn non-
18 discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT
19 underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at their base rates of
20 pay.

21 18. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(l)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
22 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium
23 pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of
24 employment.

25 19. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay at the
26 regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members routinely earned non-
27 discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay. However, when sick pay
28 was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA

1 CLASS, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as required under Cal. Lab. Code
2 Section 246.

3 20. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF and
4 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time
5 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and
6 based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful, such that
7 PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has separated are
8 entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

9 21. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to
10 collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said
11 employee." DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFF and other
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, made unlawful deductions from compensation
13 payable to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, failed to disclose all
14 aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR
15 SUB-CLASS Members, and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable
16 pay period and upon termination. PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
17 CLASS seek recovery of all illegal deductions from wages according to proof, related penalties,
18 interest, attorney fees and costs.

19 22. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
20 PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses incurred
21 by the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members in direct consequence of discharging
22 their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are
23 required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their
24 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her
25 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of
26 the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even
27 though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be
28 unlawful."

23. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

24. Specifically as to PLAINTIFF, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally required off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFF as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code and failed to pay PLAINTIFF all minimum and overtime wages due to PLAINTIFF. DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which provided timely off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and also failed to compensate PLAINTIFF for PLAINTIFF's missed meal and rest breaks. The nature of the work performed by the PLAINTIFF did not prevent PLAINTIFF from being relieved of all of PLAINTIFF's duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF with the legally required meal periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

25. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This action

1 is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of
2 DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

3 26. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
4 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
5 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and facilities in
6 this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful
7 conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

8
9 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

10 27. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
11 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, (the "UCL") as a Class Action,
12 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all individuals
13 who are or previously were employed by Dart Container Corporation of California and/or Dart
14 Container Corporation in California, including any employees staffed with Dart Container
15 Corporation of California and/or Dart Container Corporation by a third party, and classified as non-
16 exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning June 20,
17 2021 and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD").
18 The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five
19 million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

20 28. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

22 29. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
23 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
24 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
25 wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to record all meal and rest breaks
26 missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT
27 enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
28 permit this work.

1 30. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS Member was paid accurately for all meal and rest breaks missed as required by California
3 laws. The DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of policy and procedure failed to have in place
4 during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to
5 ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid as required by law. This
6 common business practice is applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be
7 adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business &
8 Professions Code §§ 17200, (the "UCL") as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of
9 this claim.

10 31. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
11 CLASS Members is impracticable.

12 32. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California law
13 by:

- 14 (a) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of , Cal. Bus. & Prof.
15 Code §§ 17200, (the "UCL"), by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively
16 having in place company policies, practices and procedures that failed to
17 record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
18 CLASS for all time worked, including minimum wages owed and overtime
19 wages owed for work performed by these employees; and,
20 (b) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by failing
21 to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

23 33. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
24 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 25 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that
26 the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their
27 claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
28

- 1 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that
2 are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
3 apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 4 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
5 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other
6 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, was classified as a non-exempt
7 employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANT's
8 deceptive practice and policy which failed to provide the legally required
9 meal and rest periods to the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby underpaid
10 compensation to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF
11 sustained economic injury as a result of DEFENDANT's employment
12 practices. PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were
13 and are similarly or identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive and
14 unfair misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,
- 15 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and
16 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained counsel
17 who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no
18 material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and
19 the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would make class
20 certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
21 vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

22 34. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
23 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 24 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
25 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of
26 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
27 create the risk of:
28

- 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
- 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.

(b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT failed to pay all wages due to members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;

- 1) With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to restitution because through this claim PLAINTIFF seeks declaratory relief holding that the DEFENDANT's policy and practices constitute unfair competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and incidental equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct declared to constitute unfair competition;

(c) Common questions of law and fact exist as to the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations of California law as listed above, and predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;
- 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation that would create the risk of:
 - A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,
 - B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests;
- 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through a representative; and,
- 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that

1 is likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant
2 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

3 35. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant to
4 Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 5 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA
7 CLASS Members because the DEFENDANT's employment practices are
8 applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 9 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
10 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA
11 CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number
12 of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their
13 rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their
14 employment;
- 15 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is
16 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the
17 Court;
- 18 (d) PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be able
19 to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained
20 as a Class Action;
- 21 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
22 relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other
23 improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and
24 injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 26 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
27 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;

- 1 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
2 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief
3 appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;
- 4 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from
5 the business records of DEFENDANT; and,
- 6 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a
7 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related
8 claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

10 36. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and identify by
11 job title each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally subjected to
12 DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek
13 leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles of similarly situated employees
14 when they have been identified.

15
16 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

17 37. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and
18 Eighth causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of the
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS who are or previously were employed by Dart Container Corporation of
20 California and/or Dart Container Corporation in California, including any employees staffed with
21 Dart Container Corporation of California and/or Dart Container Corporation by a third party, and
22 classified as non exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any time
23 during the period beginning June 20, 2021 and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the
24 "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The
25 amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is
26 under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

27 38. DEFENDANT, in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare
28 Commission ("IWC") Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law,

1 intentionally, knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to
2 correctly calculate compensation for the time worked by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and reporting time wages owed to these employees, even
4 though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work
5 and permitted or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT has denied these CALIFORNIA
6 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members wages to which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly
7 cheat the competition and unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims
8 by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR
9 SUB-CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

10 39. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and
11 identify by name and job title, each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally
12 subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged.
13 PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the complaint to include any additional job titles of similarly
14 situated employees when they have been identified.

15 40. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

17 41. Common questions of law and fact exist as to members of the CALIFORNIA
18 LABOR SUB-CLASS, including, but not limited, to the following:

- 19 (a) Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
20 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
21 for missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California Labor Code and
22 California regulations and the applicable California Wage Order;
 - 23 (b) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other
24 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized
25 wage statements;
 - 26 (c) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the
27 above-listed conduct;
- 28

1 (d) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,

3 (e) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

4 42. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS under
5 California law by:

6 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the PLAINTIFF
7 and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due
8 for overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab.
9 Code § 1194;

10 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1, by failing to accurately
11 pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
12 CLASS the correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANT is liable
13 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;

14 (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the
15 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate
16 itemized statement in writing showing the corresponding correct amount of
17 wages earned by the employee;

18 (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF
19 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with all
20 legally required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and
21 the legally required off-duty rest breaks;

22 (e) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when
23 an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay
24 the employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full
25 payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by
26 California law to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
27 who have terminated their employment; and,
28

- 1 (f) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members with necessary expenses
3 incurred in the discharge of their job duties.

4 43. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
5 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 6 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
7 numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
8 Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will
9 benefit the parties and the Court;
- 10 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that
11 are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
12 CLASS and will apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
13 CLASS;
- 14 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
15 member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all
16 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, was a non-
17 exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the
18 DEFENDANT's practice and policy which failed to pay the correct amount
19 of wages due to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF
20 sustained economic injury as a result of DEFENDANT's employment
21 practices. PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
22 SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or identically harmed by the same
23 unlawful, deceptive, and unfair misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT;
24 and,
- 25 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and
26 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has
27 retained counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action
28 litigation. There are no material conflicts between the claims of the

1 representative PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
2 SUB-CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for
3 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of
4 all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members.

5 44. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action is
6 properly maintained as a Class Action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 7 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
8 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of
9 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS will create the risk of:
- 11 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
12 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would
13 establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing
14 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,
- 15 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical
17 matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the
18 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect
19 their interests.
- 20 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or
21 refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
22 SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT fails
24 to pay all wages due. Including the correct wages for all time worked by the
25 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;
- 26 (c) Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and
28 violations of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any

1 question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
2 Members, and a Class Action is superior to other available methods for the
3 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 4 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of
6 separate actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions
7 will be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic
8 losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
9 CLASS Members when compared to the substantial expense and
10 burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;
- 11 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
12 litigation that would create the risk of:
- 13 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
14 individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of
16 conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,
- 17 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical
19 matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not
20 parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede
21 their ability to protect their interests;
- 22 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
23 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid
24 asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT,
25 which may adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or
26 with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to
27 assert their claims through a representative; and,
28

1 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
2 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will
3 obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that
4 is likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant
5 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

6 45. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant to
7 Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

- 8 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
9 CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual
10 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
- 11 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
12 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA
13 LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a
14 substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
15 Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of
16 retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- 17 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous
18 that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
19 SUB-CLASS before the Court;
- 20 (d) PLAINTIFF, and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members,
21 will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the
22 action is maintained as a Class Action;
- 23 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
24 relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other
25 improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and
26 injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 28

- 1 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
2 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 4 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
5 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-wide
6 relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as
7 a whole;
- 8 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
9 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The
10 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 Members who worked for DEFENDANT in California at any time during the
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and,
- 13 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a
14 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related
15 claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

17
18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

20 **[Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200]**

21 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

22 46. 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 47. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §
26 17021.

27 48. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, (the “UCL”) defines unfair
28 competition as any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. Section 17203

1 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair competition as
2 follows:

3 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition
4 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such
5 orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to
6 prevent the use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair
7 competition, as defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any
8 person in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have been
9 acquired by means of such unfair competition.

10 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

11 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to engage
12 in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the applicable
13 Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
14 including Sections 221, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802 and the Fair Labor
15 Standards Act and federal regulations promulgated thereunder, for which this Court should issue
16 declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be
17 necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including
18 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

24 51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and
25 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's policy and practice failed to provide the legally mandated meal
26 and rest periods, the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest periods and
27 overtime and minimum wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed to reimburse all
28 necessary business expenses incurred, and failed to provide Fair Labor Standards Act overtime
wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing to include non-discretionary incentive
compensation into their regular rates of pay for purposes of computing the proper overtime pay due
to a business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and

1 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, and for
2 which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §
3 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

8 53. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful, unfair
9 and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's policies, practices and procedures failed to provide all legally
10 required meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as
11 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

12 54. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal
14 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for each
15 workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10) hours of
16 work.

17 55. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself and each member of the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off duty
19 paid rest period was not timely provided as required by law.

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

26 57. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the Industrial
27 Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the California Labor
28 Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive and

1 unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful, unfair and deceptive business
2 practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200.

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

8 59. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further entitled
9 to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair and
10 deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from engaging in
11 any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

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

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24
25 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

27 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1]**

28 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

and Against All Defendants)

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

62. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

65. DEFENDANT maintained a wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's policy and practice was to unlawfully and intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

66. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing a policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum wage pay.

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

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

4 69. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT required,
5 permitted or suffered PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members to work
6 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. During the
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to,
9 constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

10 70. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
11 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
12 for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
13 SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are
14 presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

15 71. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
16 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for their time
17 worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance, to not
18 pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and
19 DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of
20 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wages for their time worked.

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

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

12
13 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

15 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]**

16 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

17 74. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
18 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though full set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
19 Complaint.

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

25 76. Cal. Lab. Code § 510 further provides that employees in California shall not be
26 employed more than eight (8) hours per workday and more than forty (40) hours per workweek
27 unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by
28 law.

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

5 78. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required, permitted or suffered by
7 DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked, including
8 overtime work.

9 79. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation,
10 applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing a
11 policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other
12 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
13 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked, including,
14 the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in
15 a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

16 80. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
17 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
18 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an
19 illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the
20 California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws
21 and regulations. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein, the
22 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive full
23 compensation for overtime worked.

24 81. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
25 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the
26 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. Further,
27 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were not subject to
28 a valid collective bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein

1 this Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of himself and the CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS based on DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waiveable rights
3 provided by the State of California.

4 82. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have been paid less for overtime
6 worked that they are entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

7 83. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in
9 excess of the maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194 &
10 1198, even though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
11 were required to work, and did in fact work, overtime as to which DEFENDANT failed to
12 accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and witnessed by
13 employees.

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

19 85. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other members
20 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for all overtime worked.
21 DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance, to not pay
22 employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and DEFENDANT
23 perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
24 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked.

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

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

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

16
17 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **For Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

19 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

20 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

21 88. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
22 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of
23 this Complaint.

24 89. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT from time to time failed
25 to provide all the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA
26 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The
27 nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
28 MEMBERS did not prevent these employees from being relieved of all of their duties for the legally

1 required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from time to time not fully relieved of duty by
3 DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT's failure to provide
4 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally required meal
5 breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records from
6 time to time. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were
8 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. As a result,
9 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS therefore forfeited
10 meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict
11 corporate policy and practice.

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

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

20
21 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **For Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods**

23 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

24 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

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

93. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees from time to time 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 from time to time. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-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 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

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

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

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements

[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)

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

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

(1) gross wages earned,

1 (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is
2 solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a)
3 of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
4 (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid
5 on a piece-rate basis,
6 (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may
7 be aggregated and shown as one item,
8 (5) net wages earned,
9 (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
10 (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1,
11 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee
12 identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized
13 statement,
14 (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
15 (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number
16 of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

17 98. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other
18 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements
19 which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code §
20 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate
21 itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all
22 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked
23 at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were paid on
24 an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the
25 pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were
26 earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT
27 provided to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members failed to identify
28 such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours
worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did
not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code
226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue
to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor
Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other
members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal.
Lab. Code § 226.

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

12
13 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **For Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

15 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

16 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and Against All Defendants)**

17 100. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members reallege
18 and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
19 Complaint.

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

21 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
22 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
23 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.

24 102. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by
25 failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
26 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
27 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
28

1 CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to using their
2 personal cellular phones on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically,
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required by
4 DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones and home offices in order to perform work
5 related job tasks. DEFENDANT's policy and practice was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal
7 cellular phones and home offices for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their
8 employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job
9 duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of this
10 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse
12 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for these expenses as an
13 employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

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

18
19 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages**

21 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 233, 246]**

22 **(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**
23 **and Against All Defendants)**

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

27 105. Cal Lab. Code § 233 provides that an employer must permit an employee to
28

1 use accrued sick leave in accordance with Cal Lab. Code § 246.5 at the employee's then current rate
2 of entitlement. Cal Lab. Code § 246 provides that an employee is entitled to sick pay wages for use
3 of accrued sick leave pursuant to Cal Lab. Code § 246.5. Specifically, once accrued sick leave is
4 used as paid sick time, an employee has a vested right to sick pay wages, which an employer must
5 calculate and compensate based on one of two calculations: (i) "Paid sick time for nonexempt
6 employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in
7 which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in
8 that workweek," or (ii) "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated by dividing the
9 employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked
10 in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Under Cal Lab. Code §§ 218 and 233,
11 employees may sue to recover underpaid sick pay wages as damages.

12 106. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to
13 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS at the incorrect
14 rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS
15 regularly use accrued sick leave in the workweeks in which they also earn non-hourly remuneration.
16 As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the other
17 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS at the base hourly pay, as opposed to the
18 regular rate of pay, which would consider all non-hourly remuneration in addition to base hourly
19 wages, or the rate resulting from dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime
20 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of
21 employment. As a result, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the other
22 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS.

23 107. Cal. Lab. Code § 246 specifically requires that, upon use of accrued sick leave,
24 vested sick pay wages are due and to be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll
25 period after accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides
26 that if an employer discharges an employee, wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
27 due and payable immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides that an employee is entitled to receive
28 all unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an employee quits his or her employment, unless the

1 employee has given 72-hour notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is
2 entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes untimely payments.
3 For example, Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed in
4 accordance with Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a
5 penalty from the due date, and at the same rate until paid, but the wages shall not continue for more
6 than thirty (30) days. Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203 and 218, employees may sue to recover
7 applicable penalties.

8 108. As alleged herein and as a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT
9 routinely underpays sick pay wages and thus did not timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members
10 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all owing and underpaid sick pay wages. As a result,
11 DEFENDANT violates Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 233, and 246, among other Labor Code
12 provisions. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that DEFENDANT was advised by skilled
13 lawyers and knew, or should have known, of the mandates of the Labor Code as it relates to
14 PLAINTIFF's allegations, especially since the California Supreme Court has explained that
15 "[c]ourts have recognized that 'wages' also include those benefits to which an employee is entitled
16 as a part of his or her compensation, including money, room, board, clothing, vacation pay, and sick
17 pay." *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1103 (2007)(emphasis added).
18 Because DEFENDANT willfully fails to timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all sick pay wages due, DEFENDANT is subject to
20 applicable penalties.

21 109. Such a pattern, practice, and uniform administration of corporate policy is
22 unlawful and entitles PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-
23 CLASS to underpaid sick pay wages, including interest thereon, applicable penalties, attorney's
24 fees, and costs of suit.

25 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act**

27 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698]**

28 **(By PLAINTIFF and Against All Defendants)**

1 110. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set
2 forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

3 111. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
4 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of
5 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under
6 PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to
7 benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution,
8 but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the
9 Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the
10 public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover
11 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA
12 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

13 112. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
14 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
15 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
16 with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Dart Container
17 Corporation of California and/or Dart Container Corporation in California, including any
18 employees staffed with Dart Container Corporation of California and/or Dart Container
19 Corporation by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED
20 EMPLOYEES") during the time period of July 2, 2024 until a date as determined by the
21 Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

22 113. On July 2, 2025, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the
23 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
24 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
25 Labor Code § 2699.3. See **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference
26 herein. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the
27 Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now
28 commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy

1 of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

2
3 114. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
4 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
5 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly
6 record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,
7 (d) failed to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for
8 required expenses, and (f) failed to provide a written description of applicable quotas and any
9 potential adverse employment action that could result from failure to meet the quota, all in
10 violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226(a),
11 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2802,
12 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the
13 applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such
14 conduct.¹ PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the
15 Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of
16 California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
17 EMPLOYEES.

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

21 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 22 A) That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
24 B) An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
25 DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
26

27 ¹Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor
28 Code §558(a)(3).

- 1 C) An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully withheld
2 from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS; and,
- 4 D) Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for
5 restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to PLAINTIFF and
6 to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

7 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS:

- 8 A) That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth
9 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a class action
10 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- 11 B) Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages
12 for minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFF and the other members of
13 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR
14 SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- 15 C) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which
16 a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not
18 exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs
19 for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;
- 20 D) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the
21 applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 22 E) For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and 1197;
- 23 F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
24 LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs
25 of suit.; and,
- 26 G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as
27 a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore
28 is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

- 1 3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES:
2 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys General
3 Act of 2004
4 4. On all claims:
5 A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
6 B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,
7 C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law,
8 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §221, §226, §1194, and/or §2802.
9

10 Dated: July 22, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
11

12 By: /s/ Norman B. Blumenthal

13 Norman B. Blumenthal
14 Nicholas J. De Blouw

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

Dated: July 22, 2026

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: /s/ Norman B. Blumenthal
Norman B. Blumenthal
Nicholas J. De Blouw

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

Exhibit #1

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:
nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:
1009

July 2, 2025
CA3706

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Dart Container Corporation of California
Certified Mail #9589071052700057737802
UNITED AGENT GROUP INC.
JENNIFER LEE
7801 FOLSOM BOULEVARD #202,
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Eric Gonzalez (“Plaintiff”) and all other Aggrieved Employees of Dart Container Corporation and/or Dart Container Corporation of California (“Defendant”). “Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Dart Container Corporation and/or Dart Container Corporation of California in California, including any employees staffed with Dart Container Corporation and/or Dart Container Corporation of California by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 2, 2024 until a date as determined by the Court (“PAGA Period”). Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California from February of 2015. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as 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. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock as described further below.

Specifically, Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant as a graveyard warehouse lead working at Defendant’s food and beverage packaging and processing facility, located at 150 S Maple St, Corona, CA 92878. Defendant’s facility was where Plaintiff would perform his

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

job duties consisting of checking in and checking out eight to ten drivers of truck loads and the truck loads themselves, handling shipping and receiving orders that leave and enter the facility, processing live loads that would take 3.5-4 hours each, and loading 10-12 orders for shipment per day. Each shipment would take 15-45 minutes to load and finalize for shipment. As a result of this and the time consuming work of Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees were subjected to numerous violations during their employment with Defendant.

For example, Plaintiff was regularly unable to take rest breaks and took many of his meal breaks late, after the 5th hour of work, as a result of having to process several shipments that would come into the facility and ship out of the facility in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Section 226.7, 512 & 1198. Further, Plaintiff was never encouraged to take meal or rest breaks by either of his supervisors or managers. Plaintiff's wage statements show that no rest break premium payments were paid for rest breaks that were missed or interrupted by work duties. Plaintiff's wage statements also show that none of the actual meal break violations that occurred resulted in Defendant providing meal break premium payments. Plaintiff's meal breaks were late, missed or interrupted multiple times every week. As a result of Defendant failing to pay all meal and rest break premium wages and list the correct total hours worked, the wage statements are inaccurate. Attached as **Exhibit #1** is the true and correct copies of Plaintiff's wage statements for the pay period from December 15, 2024 to December 28, 2024 showing no rest break premiums paid and no meal break premiums paid by Defendant for the year to date of 2024. Attached as **Exhibit #2** is the true and correct copies of Plaintiff's wage statements for the pay period from June 1, 2025 to June 7, 2025 showing no rest break premiums paid and no meal break premiums paid by Defendant for the year to date of 2025.

Further, as a result of having to process several shipments per day, there were also times when Plaintiff, while clocked out for a meal break, continued processing orders to keep up with each shipment coming into the facility. Further, Plaintiff kept a radio on him at all times. Plaintiff would have to answer his radio and respond to calls for help processing orders or loading shipments while clocked out for his meal break or while on his rest break. These actions resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, & 1198. Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the meal and rest break penalties described above.

Further, Defendant also paid Plaintiff nondiscretionary performance based incentive wages such as "Shift 1 Prem" "EmergTime" and "NDBonus" and "Bonus OT" but failed to include these payments into Plaintiff's regular rate for the purposes of calculating the correct overtime, sick, and vacation pay rates of pay in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 227.3, 246 & 510. Attached as **Exhibit #3** and **Exhibit #4** are true and correct copies of Plaintiff's

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

wage statement for the pay period from June 30, 2024 to July 13, 2024 and February 23, 2025 to March 8, 2025 showing those payments and violations.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses he incurred as a result of his job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. For example, there were many instances where Plaintiff used his cell phone to communicate via text and phone calls with supervisors or managers to send pictures of anything unsafe around the facility or text/call other co-workers regarding orders during the work day. Plaintiff would also take work related phone calls over the weekend to help with orders or to come in over the weekend. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the reasonable expenses incurred on his cell phone. This also led to additional unpaid off the clock work.

Further, Defendant gave Plaintiff a quota to meet of processing 2.5 trailers per day, essentially two trucks full of shipments. These shipments were typically considered live loads, which would take 3.5-4 hours each to process. For shipments leaving the facility, Plaintiff would have to pull product from the facility and stack the product in the truck. For shipments entering the facility, Plaintiff would have to unload the order, wrap up each item to ensure its safety, then put each item away for storage. Defendant failed to provide employees with a written description of applicable quotas and any potential adverse employment action that could result from failure to meet the quota. As a result of having to meet the quota given by Defendant, Plaintiff was unable to take meal and rest breaks in a timely manner. Further, the quota system prevented Plaintiff from taking breaks because the quota system failed to account for or treat time traveling to and from break areas as productive in the quota such that Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were penalized under the quota for taking breaks in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 2101, 2102 & 2103.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Nicholas De Blouw*

Nicholas De Blouw, Esq.

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

**2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

**WRITERS E-MAIL:
nick@bamlawca.com**

**WRITERS EXT:
1009**

**July 2, 2025
CA3706**

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

**Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing**

**Dart Container Corporation
Certified Mail #958907105270737796
UNITED AGENT GROUP INC.
28175 HAGGERTY ROAD
NOVI MI, 48377**

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Eric Gonzalez (“Plaintiff”) and all other Aggrieved Employees of Dart Container Corporation and/or Dart Container Corporation of California (“Defendant”). “Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Dart Container Corporation and/or Dart Container Corporation of California in California, including any employees staffed with Dart Container Corporation and/or Dart Container Corporation of California by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 2, 2024 until a date as determined by the Court (“PAGA Period”). Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California from February of 2015. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as 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. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock as described further below.

Specifically, Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant as a graveyard warehouse lead working at Defendant’s food and beverage packaging and processing facility, located at 150 S Maple St, Corona, CA 92878. Defendant’s facility was where Plaintiff would perform his job duties consisting of checking in and checking out eight to ten drivers of truck loads and

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

the truck loads themselves, handling shipping and receiving orders that leave and enter the facility, processing live loads that would take 3.5-4 hours each, and loading 10-12 orders for shipment per day. Each shipment would take 15-45 minutes to load and finalize for shipment. As a result of this and the time consuming work of Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees were subjected to numerous violations during their employment with Defendant.

For example, Plaintiff was regularly unable to take rest breaks and took many of his meal breaks late, after the 5th hour of work, as a result of having to process several shipments that would come into the facility and ship out of the facility in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Section 226.7, 512 & 1198. Further, Plaintiff was never encouraged to take meal or rest breaks by either of his supervisors or managers. Plaintiff's wage statements show that no rest break premium payments were paid for rest breaks that were missed or interrupted by work duties. Plaintiff's wage statements also show that none of the actual meal break violations that occurred resulted in Defendant providing meal break premium payments. Plaintiff's meal breaks were late, missed or interrupted multiple times every week. As a result of Defendant failing to pay all meal and rest break premium wages and list the correct total hours worked, the wage statements are inaccurate. Attached as **Exhibit #1** is the true and correct copies of Plaintiff's wage statements for the pay period from December 15, 2024 to December 28, 2024 showing no rest break premiums paid and no meal break premiums paid by Defendant for the year to date of 2024. Attached as **Exhibit #2** is the true and correct copies of Plaintiff's wage statements for the pay period from June 1, 2025 to June 7, 2025 showing no rest break premiums paid and no meal break premiums paid by Defendant for the year to date of 2025.

Further, as a result of having to process several shipments per day, there were also times when Plaintiff, while clocked out for a meal break, continued processing orders to keep up with each shipment coming into the facility. Further, Plaintiff kept a radio on him at all times. Plaintiff would have to answer his radio and respond to calls for help processing orders or loading shipments while clocked out for his meal break or while on his rest break. These actions resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, & 1198. Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the meal and rest break penalties described above.

Further, Defendant also paid Plaintiff nondiscretionary performance based incentive wages such as "Shift 1 Prem" "EmergTime" and "NDBonus" and "Bonus OT" but failed to include these payments into Plaintiff's regular rate for the purposes of calculating the correct overtime, sick, and vacation pay rates of pay in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 227.3, 246 & 510. Attached as **Exhibit #3** and **Exhibit #4** are true and correct copies of Plaintiff's wage statement for the pay period from June 30, 2024 to July 13, 2024 and February 23, 2025 to March 8, 2025 showing those payments and violations.

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses he incurred as a result of his job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. For example, there were many instances where Plaintiff used his cell phone to communicate via text and phone calls with supervisors or managers to send pictures of anything unsafe around the facility or text/call other co-workers regarding orders during the work day. Plaintiff would also take work related phone calls over the weekend to help with orders or to come in over the weekend. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the reasonable expenses incurred on his cell phone. This also led to additional unpaid off the clock work.

Further, Defendant gave Plaintiff a quota to meet of processing 2.5 trailers per day, essentially two trucks full of shipments. These shipments were typically considered live loads, which would take 3.5-4 hours each to process. For shipments leaving the facility, Plaintiff would have to pull product from the facility and stack the product in the truck. For shipments entering the facility, Plaintiff would have to unload the order, wrap up each item to ensure its safety, then put each item away for storage. Defendant failed to provide employees with a written description of applicable quotas and any potential adverse employment action that could result from failure to meet the quota. As a result of having to meet the quota given by Defendant, Plaintiff was unable to take meal and rest breaks in a timely manner. Further, the quota system prevented Plaintiff from taking breaks because the quota system failed to account for or treat time traveling to and from break areas as productive in the quota such that Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were penalized under the quota for taking breaks in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 2101, 2102 & 2103.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas De Blouw

Nicholas De Blouw, Esq.