

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)

Jeffrey S. Herman (State Bar #280058)

jeffrey@bamlawca.com

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Assigned for All Purposes:

Judge Melissa R. McCormick

Dept. CX105

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

ADDIE BAYOU, an individual, on behalf of
himself and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ONE CALL MEDICAL, INC., a Corporation;
MSC GROUP, INC., a Corporation;
TECHHEALTH, INC., a Corporation; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 30-2025-01486347-CU-OE-CXC

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE 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; and

9. CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE § 2699 FOR VIOLATIONS
OF LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, 203, 204,
210, 218, 221, 226(A), 226.7, 227.3, 246,
510, 512, 558(A)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
1198, 2100, 2802, CALIFORNIA CODE OF
REGULATIONS, TITLE 8, SECTION
11040, SUBDIVISION 5(A)-(B),
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS,
TITLE 8, SECTION 11070(14) (FAILURE
TO PROVIDE SEATING), AND THE
APPLICABLE WAGE ORDER(S).

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

THE PARTIES

1. One Call Medical, Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

2. MSC Group, Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

3. Techhealth, Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

4. One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by paycheck and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively, and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein, and are therefore collectively referred to herein as ("DEFENDANT").

5. DEFENDANT provides health services in California.

6. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT in California since 2011. PLAINTIFF has at all times been classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis,

1 and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages
2 due for all time worked.

3 7. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class, defined
4 as all individual, independent (*i.e.*, non-agency) Language and Transportation Providers who provided
5 services arranged through One Call (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time from May 29, 2021 to
6 March 10, 2026 (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate
7 claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

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

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

6 **THE CONDUCT**

7 11. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
8 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
9 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all
10 the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they are under
12 DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while
13 clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was
14 from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been
15 PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and
16 procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by
17 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that
18 during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid
19 less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than
20 "rounded" time. Additionally, DEFENDANT engages in the practice of requiring PLAINTIFF and
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work off the clock in that DEFENDANT, as a
22 condition of employment, required these employees to submit to mandatory temperature checks and
23 symptom questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior to clocking into DEFENDANT's
24 timekeeping system for the workday. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
25 Members forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by
26 working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the applicable
27 rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 Members for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

1 12. State and federal law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and
2 rest break premiums at one-and-one-half times their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and other
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that is tied to
4 specific elements of an employee’s performance.

5 13. The second component of PLAINTIFF’s and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’
6 compensation is DEFENDANT’s non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF and
7 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their performance for
8 DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all employees paid on an hourly
9 basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
10 DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular rate of pay in order to pay overtime and
11 meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members,
12 DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the employees’ “regular rate
13 of pay” for purposes of calculating overtime pay and meal and rest break premium pay.

14 Management and supervisors described the incentive program to potential and new employees as
15 part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by
16 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the “regular rate of
17 pay.” The failure to do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and
18 rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

19 14. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
20 CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and
21 were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for
23 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT
24 from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second
25 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT
26 to work ten (10) hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal
27 period times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

1 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without
2 additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

3 15. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without
5 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest
6 periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from
7 time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of
8 between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at
9 least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time.

10 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour
11 wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to
12 provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time
13 during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control.
14 In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and
15 permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties
16 and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the
17 locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that
18 prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes back. Here,
19 DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members from
20 unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which states PLAINTIFF and
21 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members cannot leave the work premises during their rest period.

22 16. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately
23 record and pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual amount of
24 time these employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
25 DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all
26 time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an
27 employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work.
28 DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the time

1 they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that
2 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under compensated for all
3 time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited time
4 worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the
5 applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off the
6 clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT fails to pay minimum wages
7 for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

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

26 18. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
27 CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in violation of Cal. Lab.
28 Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt employees earn non-

1 discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT
2 underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at their base rates of
3 pay.

4 19. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(1)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
5 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium
6 pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of
7 employment.

8 20. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay at the
9 regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members routinely earned non-
10 discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay. However, when sick pay
11 was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as required under Cal. Lab. Code
13 Section 246.

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

20 22. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to
21 collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said
22 employee." DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFF and other
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, made unlawful deductions from compensation
24 payable to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, failed to disclose all
25 aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR
26 SUB-CLASS Members, and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable
27 pay period and upon termination. PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
28

1 CLASS seek recovery of all illegal deductions from wages according to proof, related penalties,
2 interest, attorney fees and costs.

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

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

23 25. Specifically as to PLAINTIFF, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
24 required off-duty meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFF as required by the applicable Wage Order and
25 Labor Code and failed to pay PLAINTIFF all minimum and overtime wages due to PLAINTIFF.
26 DEFENDANT did not have a policy or practice which provided timely off-duty meal and rest
27 breaks to PLAINTIFF and also failed to compensate PLAINTIFF for PLAINTIFF's missed meal
28 and rest breaks. The nature of the work performed by the PLAINTIFF did not prevent PLAINTIFF

1 from being relieved of all of PLAINTIFF's duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As
2 a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF with the legally required meal periods is
3 evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF
4 individually does not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

5 26. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, class members were classified by
6 DEFENDANT as exempt from overtime pay, meal and rest periods, and reimbursement of business
7 expenses and works in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a
8 workweek, but as a result of DEFENDANT's misclassification of PLAINTIFFS as exempt from
9 the applicable California Labor Code provisions, PLAINTIFFS are not compensated by
10 DEFENDANT for their overtime worked, missed meal and rest breaks, and her business expenses
11 she incurred as a result of her job duties for Defendant. DEFENDANT does not have a policy or
12 practice which provides meal and rest breaks to PLAINTIFFS and also fails to compensate
13 PLAINTIFFS for their missed meal and rest breaks. As a consequence of the foregoing,
14 PLAINTIFFS are not provided with accurate and itemized wage statements showing the gross
15 wages earned, the net wages earned, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period,
16 including overtime hourly rates, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate,
17 by DEFENDANT during the CALIFORNIA EXEMPT CLASS PERIOD in violation of Cal. Lab.
18 Code § 226(a).

19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

24 28. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
25 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
26 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and facilities in
27
28

1 this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful
2 conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

3
4 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

5 29. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
6 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, (the "UCL") as a Class Action,
7 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all individual,
8 independent (*i.e.*, non-agency) Language and Transportation Providers who provided services
9 arranged through One Call (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time from May 29, 2021 to March
10 10, 2026 (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate
11 claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

12 30. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

14 31. DEFENDANT, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
15 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
16 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
17 wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to record all meal and rest breaks
18 missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT
19 enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
20 permit this work.

21 32. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS Member was paid accurately for all meal and rest breaks missed as required by California
23 laws. The DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of policy and procedure failed to have in place
24 during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to
25 ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid as required by law. This
26 common business practice is applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be
27 adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business &
28

1 Professions Code §§ 17200, (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of
2 this claim.

3 33. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members is impracticable.

5 34. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California law
6 by:

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

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

- 18 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that
19 the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their
20 claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 21 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that
22 are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
23 apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 24 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of
25 each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF , like all the other
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, was classified as a non-exempt
27 employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANT’s
28 deceptive practice and policy which failed to provide the legally required

1 meal and rest periods to the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby underpaid
2 compensation to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF
3 sustained economic injury as a result of DEFENDANT's employment
4 practices. PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were
5 and are similarly or identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive and
6 unfair misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,

- 7 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and
8 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained counsel
9 who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no
10 material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and
11 the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would make class
12 certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
13 vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

- 16 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,
17 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of
18 separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
19 create the risk of:

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

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

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

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

19 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
20 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions
21 in that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to
22 recover the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by
23 the individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to
24 the substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this
25 litigation;

26 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
27 litigation that would create the risk of:
28

- 1 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
2 individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which
3 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
4 DEFENDANT; and/or,
5 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be
7 dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to
8 the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability
9 to protect their interests;
- 10 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
11 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their
12 legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may
13 adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or with a
14 subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert
15 their claims through a representative; and,
16 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
17 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will
18 obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that
19 is likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant
20 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

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

- 23 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS Members because the DEFENDANT's employment practices are
26 applied with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
27 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
28 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA

1 CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number
2 of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their
3 rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their
4 employment;

5 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is
6 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before the
7 Court;

8 (d) PLAINTIFF , and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not be
9 able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is
10 maintained as a Class Action;

11 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
12 relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other
13 improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and
14 injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS;

16 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
17 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;

19 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
20 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief
21 appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;

22 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from
23 the business records of DEFENDANT; and,

24 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a
25 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related
26 claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS.
28

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

6
7 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

8 39. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and
9 Eighth causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all individual, independent (*i.e.*,
10 non-agency) Language and Transportation Providers who provided services arranged through One
11 Call (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any time from May 29, 2021 to March 10,
12 2026 (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
13 382. The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

15 40. DEFENDANT, in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare
16 Commission ("IWC") Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law,
17 intentionally, knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to
18 correctly calculate compensation for the time worked by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and reporting time wages owed to these employees, even
20 though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work
21 and permitted or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT has denied these CALIFORNIA
22 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members wages to which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly
23 cheat the competition and unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims
24 by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR
25 SUB-CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

26 41. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and
27 identify by name and job title, each of DEFENDANT's employees who have been intentionally
28 subjected to DEFENDANT's company policy, practices and procedures as herein alleged.

1 PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the complaint to include any additional job titles of similarly
2 situated employees when they have been identified.

3 42. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

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

- 7 (a) Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
8 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
9 for missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California Labor Code and
10 California regulations and the applicable California Wage Order;
- 11 (b) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other
12 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized
13 wage statements;
- 14 (c) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the
15 above-listed conduct;
- 16 (d) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,
- 18 (e) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

19 44. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS under
20 California law by:

- 21 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the PLAINTIFF
22 and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due
23 for overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab.
24 Code § 1194;
- 25 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1, by failing to accurately
26 pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
27 CLASS the correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANT is liable
28 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;

- 1 (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the
2 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate
3 itemized statement in writing showing the corresponding correct amount of
4 wages earned by the employee;
- 5 (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF
6 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with all
7 legally required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and
8 the legally required off-duty rest breaks;
- 9 (e) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when
10 an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay
11 the employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full
12 payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by
13 California law to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 who have terminated their employment; and,
- 15 (f) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF and
16 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members with necessary expenses
17 incurred in the discharge of their job duties.

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

- 20 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
21 numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
22 Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will
23 benefit the parties and the Court;
- 24 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that
25 are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS and will apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
27 CLASS;
- 28

1 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of
2 each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF ,
3 like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, was
4 a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the
5 DEFENDANT's practice and policy which failed to pay the correct amount
6 of wages due to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF
7 sustained economic injury as a result of DEFENDANT's employment
8 practices. PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
9 SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or identically harmed by the same
10 unlawful, deceptive, and unfair misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT;
11 and,

12 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and
13 protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has
14 retained counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action
15 litigation. There are no material conflicts between the claims of the
16 representative PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
17 SUB-CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for
18 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of
19 all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members.

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

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

26 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
27 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would
28

1 establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing
2 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,

3 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical
5 matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the
6 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect
7 their interests.

8 (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or
9 refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
10 SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the
11 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT fails
12 to pay all wages due. Including the correct wages for all time worked by the
13 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;

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

20 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
21 CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of
22 separate actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions
23 will be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic
24 losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
25 CLASS Members when compared to the substantial expense and
26 burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

27 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
28 litigation that would create the risk of:

- 1 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to
2 individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
3 CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of
4 conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,
5 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical
7 matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not
8 parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede
9 their ability to protect their interests;
- 10 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
11 individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid
12 asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT,
13 which may adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or
14 with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to
15 assert their claims through a representative; and,
16 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
17 efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will
18 obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that
19 is likely to result in the absence of certification of this action pursuant
20 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

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

- 23 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual
25 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
26 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
27 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA
28 LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a

1 substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

2 Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of
3 retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;

4 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous
5 that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
6 SUB-CLASS before the Court;

7 (d) PLAINTIFF , and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members,
8 will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the
9 action is maintained as a Class Action;

10 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
11 relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations and other
12 improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and
13 injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted upon the
14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;

15 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
16 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;

18 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
19 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby making final class-wide
20 relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as
21 a whole;

22 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
23 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The
24 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA CLASS
25 Members who worked for DEFENDANT in California at any time during the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and,

27 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a
28 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related

claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to the members of the
CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

For Unlawful Business Practices

[Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200]

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

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

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

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

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

Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code including Sections 221, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802 and the Fair Labor Standards Act and federal regulations promulgated thereunder, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be

1 necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including
2 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

8 53. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and
9 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's policy and practice failed to provide the legally mandated meal
10 and rest periods, the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest periods and
11 overtime and minimum wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed to reimburse all
12 necessary business expenses incurred, and failed to provide Fair Labor Standards Act overtime
13 wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing to include non-discretionary incentive
14 compensation into their regular rates of pay for purposes of computing the proper overtime pay due
15 to a business practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and
16 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, and for
17 which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §
18 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

27 56. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal

1 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for each
2 workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10) hours of
3 work.

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

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

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

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

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

27 62. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
28 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of

1 DEFENDANT. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a
2 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other
3 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal
4 and economic harm unless DEFENDANT is restrained from continuing to engage in these unlawful
5 and unfair business practices.

6
7 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

11 **and Against All Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 71. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT required,
15 permitted or suffered PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members to work
16 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. During the
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to,
19 constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

25 73. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
26 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for their time
27 worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance, to not
28 pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and

1 DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of
2 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wages for their time worked.

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

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

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]**

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

5 76. PLAINTIFF , and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS,
6 reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though full set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
7 Complaint.

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

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

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

21 80. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required, permitted or suffered by
23 DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked, including
24 overtime work.

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

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

4 82. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
5 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
6 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an
7 illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the
8 California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws
9 and regulations. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein, the
10 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive
11 full compensation for overtime worked.

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

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

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

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

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

8 87. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other members
9 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for all overtime worked.
10 DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross nonfeasance, to not pay
11 employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and DEFENDANT
12 perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
13 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked.

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

22 89. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
23 therefore request recovery of all overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well
24 as the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
25 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum and/or overtime
26 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who
27 have terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201
28 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal.

1 Lab. Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR
2 SUB-CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not
3 in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are
4 entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

5
6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

8 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

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

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

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

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

6 93 As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to
8 proof at trial, and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

9
10 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

17 95. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were from
18 time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute
19 rest periods. Further, these employees from time to time were denied their first rest periods of at
20 least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second
21 rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8)
22 hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of
23 ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their
25 rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
26 were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

27 96. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
28 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.

97. 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)

98. 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.

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

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

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

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

16 101. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code §
17 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
18 LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating
19 the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which
20 were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
21 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS may
22 elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the
23 violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
24 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
25 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member of
26 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS herein).

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

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

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

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

9 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
10 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
11 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.

12 104. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by
13 failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
15 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
16 CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to using their
17 personal cellular phones on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically,
18 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required by
19 DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones and home offices in order to perform work
20 related job tasks. DEFENDANT's policy and practice was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal
22 cellular phones and home offices for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their
23 employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job
24 duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of this
25 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse
27
28

1 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for these expenses as an
2 employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

3 105. PLAINTIFF therefore demand reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred by
4 himself and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties
5 for DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with interest at the
6 statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

7
8 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages**

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

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

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

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

28 108. As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to

1 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS at the incorrect
2 rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS
3 regularly use accrued sick leave in the workweeks in which they also earn non-hourly remuneration.
4 As a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT pays sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS at the base hourly pay, as opposed to
6 the regular rate of pay, which would consider all non-hourly remuneration in addition to base hourly
7 wages, or the rate resulting from dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime
8 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of
9 employment. As a result, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the other
10 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS.

11 109. Cal. Lab. Code § 246 specifically requires that, upon use of accrued sick leave,
12 vested sick pay wages are due and to be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll
13 period after accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides
14 that if an employer discharges an employee, wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are
15 due and payable immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides that an employee is entitled to receive
16 all unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an employee quits his or her employment, unless the
17 employee has given 72-hour notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is
18 entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes untimely payments.
19 For example, Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed in
20 accordance with Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a
21 penalty from the due date, and at the same rate until paid, but the wages shall not continue for more
22 than thirty (30) days. Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203 and 218, employees may sue to recover
23 applicable penalties.

24 110. As alleged herein and as a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT
25 routinely underpays sick pay wages and thus did not timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members
26 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all owing and underpaid sick pay wages. As a result,
27 DEFENDANT violates Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203, 233, and 246, among other Labor Code
28 provisions. PLAINTIFF IS informed and believes that DEFENDANT was advised by skilled

1 lawyers and knew, or should have known, of the mandates of the Labor Code as it relates to
2 PLAINTIFF's allegations, especially since the California Supreme Court has explained that
3 "[c]ourts have recognized that 'wages' also include those benefits to which an employee is entitled
4 as a part of his or her compensation, including money, room, board, clothing, vacation pay, *and sick*
5 *pay.*" *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1103 (2007)(emphasis added).
6 Because DEFENDANT willfully fails to timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all sick pay wages due, DEFENDANT is subject to
8 applicable penalties.

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

13 14 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

16 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698]**

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

18 112. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
19 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

20 113. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor
21 laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's
22 labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally
23 a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The
24 purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing"
25 citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California
26 Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as
27 private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch.
28 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

1 114. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the
2 requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act,
3 brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all individual,
4 independent (i.e., non-agency) Language and Transportation Providers who provided services
5 arranged through Defendant One Call Medical, Inc., ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") from March
6 31, 2024 through March 10, 2026 (the "PAGA PERIOD").

7 115. On December 9, 2024, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the
8 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the employer of
9 the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code §
10 2699.3. See Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein (PAGA Notice
11 only without draft complaint). The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations
12 to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now
13 commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the
14 State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

15 116. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
16 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly record and
18 provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages, (d) failed to pay
19 overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for required expenses, (f)
20 failed to provide wages when due, and (g) failed to provide suitable seating, all in violation of the
21 applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226(a),
22 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100, 2802, California Code
23 of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title
24 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby
25 gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct. PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only
26 civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the
27 representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the
28 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

1
2 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

3 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally,
4 as follows:

5 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 6 A) That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
8 B) An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
9 DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
10 C) An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully withheld
11 from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS; and,
13 D) Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for
14 restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to PLAINTIFF and
15 to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

- 17 A) That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth
18 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a class action
19 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
20 B) Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages
21 for minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFF and the other members of
22 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR
23 SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
24 C) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which
25 a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not
27 exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs
28 for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;

- 1 D) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the
2 applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 3 E) For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and 1197;
- 4 F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
5 LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs
6 of suit.; and,
- 7 G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as
8 a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore
9 is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 10 3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES:
- 11 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys General
12 Act of 2004; and
- 13 B) An award of attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including but
14 not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699;
- 15 4. On all claims:
- 16 A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 17 B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,
- 18 C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law,
19 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §221, §226, §1194, and/or §2802.

20
21 Dated: July 13, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

22
23 By: /s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

24 Norman B. Blumenthal
Nicholas J. De Blouw

25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
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 13, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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:

1004

December 9, 2024

CA3339

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Techhealth, Inc.

Certified Mail #9589071052701502088227
CORPORATE CREATIONS NETWORK
INC.

JENNIFER LEE

7801 FOLSOM BOULEVARD #202,
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100 *et seq.*, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of December 9, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Addie Bayou (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from 2011 to April of 2024. Plaintiff was 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. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required

Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

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

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

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. 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

WRITERS E-MAIL:

Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:

1004

December 9, 2024

CA3339

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

MSC Group, Inc.

Certified Mail #9589071052701502088210
CORPORATE CREATIONS NETWORK
INC.

JENNIFER LEE

7801 FOLSOM BOULEVARD #202,
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100 *et seq.*, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of December 9, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Addie Bayou (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from 2011 to April of 2024. Plaintiff was 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. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required

Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

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

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

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. 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

WRITERS E-MAIL:

Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:

1004

December 9, 2024

CA3339

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

One Call Medical, Inc.
Certified Mail #9589071052701502088203
CORPORATE CREATIONS NETWORK
INC.
JENNIFER LEE
7801 FOLSOM BOULEVARD #202,
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100 *et seq.*, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of December 9, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Addie Bayou (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against One Call Medical, Inc. and/or MSC Group, Inc. and/or Techhealth, Inc. and/or Align Networks, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from 2011 to April of 2024. Plaintiff was 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. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required

Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

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

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

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.