

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)

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,

County of San Diego

2/3/2025 3:09:22 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court

By A. Villasenor ,Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CHEYENNE GARCIA, an individual, on behalf
of herself and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LIBOR MANAGEMENT LLC, a limited liability
company; CHOICE HOTELS
INTERNATIONAL SERVICES CORP., a
corporation; CHOICE HOTELS
INTERNATIONAL, INC., a corporation; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24CU006073C

**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, *et seq.* for violations of 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), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

1 Cheyenne Garcia (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and all other
2 similarly situated current and former employees alleges on information and belief, except for
3 her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following.

4
5 **THE PARTIES**

6 1. Libor Management LLC is a limited liability company that at all relevant times
7 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

8 2. Choice Hotels International Services Corp. is a corporation that at all relevant
9 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

10 3. Choice Hotels International, Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times
11 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

12 4. Libor Management LLC, Choice Hotels International Services Corp., and Choice
13 Hotels International, Inc. are the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by paycheck and
14 by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively, and are therefore jointly
15 responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein, and are therefore collectively referred
16 to herein as ("DEFENDANT").

17 5. DEFENDANT owns and operates hotels in California.

18 6. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT in California since November
19 4, 2022. PLAINTIFF is at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid
20 on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of
21 minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

22 7. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
23 defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by Libor Management LLC
24 and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. in
25 California, including any employees staffed with Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels
26 International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. by a third party, and
27 classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the
28 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as

1 determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy
2 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
3 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

24 10. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them
25 acting on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its
26 authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally
27 participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the
28 conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to

1 the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and
2 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result
3 of the conduct of the Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

4 5 **THE CONDUCT**

6 11. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT
7 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time
8 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
9 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.
10 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without
11 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,
12 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to
13 be PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by
14 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal
15 break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers
16 a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the
18 course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid less
19 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
21 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work off the clock in that
22 DEFENDANT, as a condition of employment, required these employees to submit to
23 mandatory temperature checks and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior
24 to clocking into DEFENDANT's timekeeping system for the workday. As a result,
25 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeit minimum wage, overtime
26 wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly
27 recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and
28

1 practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time
2 worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

7 13. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members' compensation is DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
9 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
10 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
11 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
12 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular
13 rate of pay in order to pay overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and
14 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive
15 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating
16 overtime pay and meal and rest break premium pay. Management and supervisors described
17 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
18 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other
19 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure
20 to do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and rest break
21 premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANT.

22 14. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
23 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute
24 off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF
25 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required from time to time to perform
26 work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without
27 receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide
28 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period for

1 some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10)
2 hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period
3 times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.
4 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks
5 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy
6 and practice.

7 15. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required from time to time to work in excess of
9 four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees
10 were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at
11 least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten
12 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to
13 time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts
14 worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
15 CLASS Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally,
16 the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-
17 duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an
18 employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so
19 doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and
20 permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all
21 duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control
22 over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose
23 controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes
24 back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS Members from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule
26 which states PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members cannot leave the work
27 premises during their rest period.

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

17 17. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
18 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements
19 which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab.
20 Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an
21 accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages
22 earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
23 amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all
25 applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable
26 pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section
27 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and other
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members failed to identify such information. More specifically, the

1 wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When
2 the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total
3 hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from
4 the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF
5 an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226.
6 As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the other members
7 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

8 18. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in
10 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt
11 employees earn non-discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate
12 of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members at their base rates of pay.

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

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

24 21. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF
25 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS their correct wages and accordingly owe
26 waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is
27 informed and believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular
28 rate was willful, such that PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose

1 employment has separated are entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code
2 Sections 201-203.

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

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

23 24. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
24 CLASS Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own
25 personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
26 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost
27 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit.
28 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by

1 DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their
2 employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to,
4 costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit
5 of DEFENDANT.

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

17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

22 27. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
23 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
24 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and
25 facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii)
26 committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS.
28

THE CALIFORNIA CLASS

28. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, (the "UCL") as a Class Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

31. DEFENDANT has the legal burden to establish that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately for all meal and rest breaks missed as required by California laws. The DEFENDANT, however, as a matter of policy and procedure failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 Member is paid as required by law. This common business practice is applicable to each
2 and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a class-wide basis as
3 unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, (the
4 “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this claim.

5 32. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS Members is impracticable.

7 33. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under
8 California law by:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish

1 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,

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

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

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

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

27 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
28 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate

actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

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

A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANT; and/or,

B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests;

3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual's job with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through a representative; and,

4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of

certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

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

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

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

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

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

18 38. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh
19 and Eighth Causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of the
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS who are or previously were employed by Libor Management LLC
21 and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc.
22 in California, including any employees staffed with Libor Management LLC and/or Choice
23 Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. by a third party,
24 and classified as non exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at
25 any time during the period three (3) years prior to the filing of the complaint and ending on
26 the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD")
27 pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy for the aggregate
28

1 claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under five million dollars
2 (\$5,000,000.00).

3 39. DEFENDANT, in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare
4 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California
5 law, intentionally, knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT
6 failed to correctly calculate compensation for the time worked by PLAINTIFF and the other
7 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and reporting time wages owed to
8 these employees, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required
9 employees to perform this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work.

10 DEFENDANT has denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members wages to
11 which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly cheat the competition and unlawfully
12 profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA LABOR
13 SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD
14 should be adjusted accordingly.

15 40. DEFENDANT maintains records from which the Court can ascertain and
16 identify by name and job title, each of DEFENDANT’s employees who have been
17 intentionally subjected to DEFENDANT’s company policy, practices and procedures as
18 herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the complaint to include any
19 additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

20 41. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

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

- 24 (a) Whether DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
25 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS for missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California
27 Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable California
28 Wage Order;

- 1 (b) Whether DEFENDANT failed to provide the PLAINTIFF and the
2 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with
3 accurate itemized wage statements;
4 (c) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the
5 above-listed conduct;
6 (d) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of
7 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,
8 (e) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

9 43. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
10 CLASS under California law by:

- 11 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the
12 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
13 CLASS all wages due for overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is
14 liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194;
15 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1, by failing to
16 accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA
17 LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wage pay for which
18 DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
19 (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and
20 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an
21 accurate itemized statement in writing showing the corresponding
22 correct amount of wages earned by the employee;
23 (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide
24 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
25 SUB-CLASS with all legally required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty
26 (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required off-duty rest breaks;
27
28

- 1 (e) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that
2 when an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the
3 employer must pay the employee all wages due without abatement, by
4 failing to tender full payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the
5 manner required by California law to the members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated their
7 employment; and,
- 8 (f) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF
9 and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members with necessary
10 expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties.

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

- 13 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 are so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as
16 a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 17 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief
18 issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the
19 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply to every member
20 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 21 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims
22 of each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
23 PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
24 SUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who
25 was subjected to the DEFENDANT's practice and policy which failed
26 to pay the correct amount of wages due to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
27 SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a result of
28

1 DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members
2 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or
3 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, and unfair
4 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,

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

14 45. In addition to meeting the statutory prerequisites to a Class Action, this action
15 is 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
18 of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA
19 LABOR SUB-CLASS will create the risk of:
- 20 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
21 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which
22 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
23 parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or,
 - 24 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the
25 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a
26 practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members
27
28

1 not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede
2 their ability to protect their interests.

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

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

- 17 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
18 SUB-CLASS in individually controlling the prosecution or
19 defense of separate actions in that the substantial expense of
20 individual actions will be avoided to recover the relatively small
21 amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
22 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared
23 to the substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution
24 of this litigation;
- 25 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative
26 litigation that would create the risk of:
- 27
28

- 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
7 practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other
8 members not parties to the adjudication or substantially
9 impair or impede 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
12 avoid asserting their legal rights out of fear of retaliation by
13 DEFENDANT, which may adversely affect an individual's job
14 with DEFENDANT or with a subsequent employer, the Class
15 Action is the only means to assert their claims through a
16 representative; and,
17 4) A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair
18 and efficient adjudication of this litigation because class
19 treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary
20 duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of
21 certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §
22 382.

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

- 25 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
26 SUB-CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
28

- 1 (b) A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair
2 and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the
3 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of
4 employment litigation a substantial number of individual
5 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting
6 their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on
7 their employment;
- 8 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
9 numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the
10 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;
- 11 (d) PLAINTIFF , and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
12 Members, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal
13 redress unless the action is maintained as a Class Action;
- 14 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and
15 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations
16 and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for
17 the damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted
18 upon the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- 19 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
20 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of
21 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 22 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally
23 applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, thereby
24 making final class-wide relief appropriate with respect to the
25 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole;
- 26 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are readily
27 ascertainable from the business records of DEFENDANT. The
28

1 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS consists of all CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS Members who worked for DEFENDANT in California at any
3 time during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD; and,
4 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to
5 bring a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and
6 hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to
7 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS.
8

9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

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

9 51. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were unlawful and
10 unfair in that these practices violate public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive,
11 unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or
12 utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section
13 17203 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages
14 wrongfully withheld.

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 58. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the
24 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the
25 California Labor Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral,
26 unethical, oppressive and unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful,
27 unfair and deceptive business practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200.
28

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

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

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

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages

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

(By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

and Against All Defendants)

62. 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.

63. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for

1 DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF
2 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

25 69. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged
26 herein, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
27
28

1 did not receive the correct minimum wage compensation for their time worked for
2 DEFENDANT.

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

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

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

22 73. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California
23 labor laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS for all time worked and provide them with the requisite compensation,
25 DEFENDANT acted and continues to act intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously
26 toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
27 with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the consequences to them, and
28

1 with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal rights, and otherwise
2 causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of these employees.

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

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

17 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]**

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

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

23 76. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
24 CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the
25 California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for
26 DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all overtime worked, including, work
27
28

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

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

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

12 79. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and
13 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were required, permitted or suffered by
14 DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time they worked,
15 including overtime work.

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

24 81. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
25 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
26 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB CLASS Members. DEFENDANT
27 acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in
28

1 violation of the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements
2 and other applicable laws and regulations. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful
3 wage practices as alleged herein, the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive full compensation for overtime
5 worked.

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

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

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

24 85. By virtue of DEFENDANT's unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
25 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
26 CLASS for the true amount of time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an
28

1 economic injury in amounts which are presently unknown to them and which will be
2 ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

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

3
4 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

6 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

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

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

12 90. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT from time to time
13 failed to provide all the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other
14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order
15 and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA
16 LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS did not prevent these employees from being relieved of
17 all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous
18 work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
19 were from time to time not fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods.
20 Additionally, DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
21 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th)
22 hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records from time to time. Further,
23 DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a
24 second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were required by
25 DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work from time to time. As a result, PLAINTIFF
26 and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS therefore forfeited meal
27
28

1 breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict
2 corporate policy and practice.

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

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

12
13 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

21 94. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
22 from time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten
23 (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees from time to time were denied their first
24 rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)
25 hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of
26 between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten
27 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time.

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not
2 provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules,
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically
4 denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

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

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

14 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **For Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

16 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]**

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

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

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

- 24 (1) gross wages earned,
25 (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
26 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
Industrial Welfare Commission,
27 (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
is paid on a piece-rate basis,
28

1 (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
2 employee may be aggregated and shown as one item,
3 (5) net wages earned,
4 (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
5 (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
6 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.

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

27 100. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab.
28 Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

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

11
12 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

14 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

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

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

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

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

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

1 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not
2 limited to, costs related to using their personal cellular phones on behalf of and for the
3 benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR
4 SUB-CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular
5 phones and home offices in order to perform work related job tasks. DEFENDANT's policy
6 and practice was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
7 CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal cellular phones and home
8 offices for DEFENDANT within the course and scope of their employment for
9 DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties.
10 DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of this
11 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF
12 and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify
13 and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for
14 these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.
15 104. PLAINTIFF therefore demand reimbursement for expenditures or losses
16 incurred by herself and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members in the discharge
17 of their job duties for DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT,
18 with interest at the statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

19
20 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages**

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

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

24 **and Against All Defendants)**

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

1 106. Cal Lab. Code § 233 provides that an employer must permit an employee to
2 use accrued sick leave in accordance with Cal Lab. Code § 246.5 at the employee's then
3 current rate of entitlement. Cal Lab. Code § 246 provides that an employee is entitled to
4 sick pay wages for use of accrued sick leave pursuant to Cal Lab. Code § 246.5.
5 Specifically, once accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time, an employee has a vested
6 right to sick pay wages, which an employer must calculate and compensate based on one of
7 two calculations: (i) "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the
8 same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid
9 sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek," or (ii)
10 "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated by dividing the employee's
11 total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in
12 the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Under Cal Lab. Code §§ 218 and
13 233, employees may sue to recover underpaid sick pay wages as damages.

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

26 108. Cal. Lab. Code § 246 specifically requires that, upon use of accrued sick
27 leave, vested sick pay wages are due and to be paid no later than the payday for the next
28

1 regular payroll period after accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab.
2 Code § 201 provides that if an employer discharges an employee, wages earned and unpaid
3 at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides
4 that an employee is entitled to receive all unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an
5 employee quits his or her employment, unless the employee has given 72-hour notice of his
6 or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time
7 of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes untimely payments. For example, Cal. Lab. Code §
8 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed in accordance with Cal.
9 Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the
10 due date, and at the same rate until paid, but the wages shall not continue for more than
11 thirty (30) days. Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203 and 218, employees may sue to recover
12 applicable penalties.

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

27 110. Such a pattern, practice, and uniform administration of corporate policy is
28

1 unlawful and entitles PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-
2 SUB-CLASS to underpaid sick pay wages, including interest thereon, applicable penalties,
3 attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

4 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

8 111. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set
9 forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

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

20 113. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
21 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
22 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
23 with respect to herself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by Libor
24 Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels
25 International, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Libor Management
26 LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International,
27 Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED
28

1 EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of June 20, 2023 until a date as determined by the
2 Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

3 114. On June 20, 2024, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the
4 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
5 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
6 Labor Code § 2699.3. See **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference
7 herein (*PAGA Notice only without draft complaint*). The statutory waiting period for
8 PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to
9 Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA
10 pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all
11 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

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

26
27 ¹Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor
28 Code §558(a)(3).

representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

116. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect PLAINTIFF during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF seeks penalties for those violations that affected the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.* 30 Cal. App. 5th 504 (2018).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

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

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

- 1 B) Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
2 damages for minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFF and the
3 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the
4 applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon
5 at the statutory rate;
- 6 C) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period
7 in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of
8 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay
9 period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and
10 an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;
- 11 D) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
12 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 13 E) For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and
14 1197;
- 15 F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the
16 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties,
17 plus interest, and costs of suit.; and,
- 18 G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR
19 SUB-CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or
20 until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 21 3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
22 EMPLOYEES:
- 23 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private
24 Attorneys General Act of 2004; and,
- 25 B) An award of attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the
26 law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.
- 27 4. On all claims:
- 28

- A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,
- C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §221, §226, §1194, and/or §2802.

Dated: December 18, 2024

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

Dated: December 18, 2024 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

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

CENTURION TRIAL ATTORNEYS, APC
Ryan Stygar (State Bar #332764)
8880 Rio San Diego Dr., Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92108

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

EXHIBIT 1

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

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

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:

Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:

1004

June 20, 2024

CA3337

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Choice Hotels International Services Corp.
Certified Mail #9589071052702162292238
CSC - LAWYERS INCORPORATING
SERVICE
BECKY DEGEORGE
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, Suite
150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

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, 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 Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of June 20, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Cheyenne Garcia (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California November 4, 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. 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 or 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

June 20, 2024

CA3337

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Choice Hotels International, Inc.
Certified Mail #9589071052702162292252
CSC - LAWYERS INCORPORATING
SERVICE
BECKY DEGEORGE
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, Suite
150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

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, 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 Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of June 20, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Cheyenne Garcia (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California November 4, 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. 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 or 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

June 20, 2024

CA3337

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Libor Management LLC
Certified Mail #9589071052702162292245
Cogency Global Inc.
ERIN HAGGERTY
1325 J ST STE 1550,
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

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, 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 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 Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of June 20, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Cheyenne Garcia (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Libor Management LLC and/or Choice Hotels International Services Corp. and/or Choice Hotels International, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California November 4, 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. 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 Statue 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.