

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

Jeffrey S. Herman (State Bar #280058)

jeffrey@bamlawca.com

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,

County of Imperial

12/17/2025 at 10:49:36 AM

By: Angela Jantz, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

JOSE MIGUEL GASTELUM, an individual, on behalf
of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BODY FIT PLUS INC., a corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. ECU003585

**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 PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
9. FAILURE TO PAY SICK PAY WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201-203, 233, 246; and
10. CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699, *et. seq.* FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODES §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, *et. seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1188, 2100 *et. seq.*, 2802, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 8, SECTION 11040, SUBDIVISION 5 (A)-(B). CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 8, SECTION 11070(14) (FAILURE TO PROVIDE SEATING), AND THE APPLICABLE WAGE ORDER(S).

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

4 **THE PARTIES**

5 1. Body Fit Plus Inc. ("DEFENDANT") is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned
6 herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

7 2. DEFENDANT is a healthcare workforce management and services company operating in
8 California.

9 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from January 2022 to August
10 2023. PLAINTIFF was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an
11 hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and
12 overtime wages due for all time worked.

13 4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class, defined
14 as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any
15 employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (the
16 “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this
17 Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The
18 amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million
19 dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

20 5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT’s policy and practice which failed to
23 lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT’s policy and practice alleged herein was an
24 unlawful, unfair and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANT retained and continues to
25 retain wages due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and
26 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction enjoining such conduct by
27 DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
28

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by DEFENDANT's past and current
2 unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

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

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

18 19 THE CONDUCT

20 8. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
21 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked, meaning
22 the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the
23 employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA
24 CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control.
25 Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is
26 supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by
27 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break.
28 DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers a uniform

1 practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment,
3 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid less than they would have been paid had
4 they been paid for actual recorded time rather than “rounded” time. Additionally, DEFENDANT
5 engages in the practice of requiring PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
6 off the clock in that DEFENDANT, as a condition of employment, required these employees to submit
7 to mandatory temperature checks and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior to
8 clocking into DEFENDANT’s timekeeping system for the workday. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty
10 meal breaks by working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the
11 applicable rates. DEFENDANT’s policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS Members for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records.

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

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

1 and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by
2 DEFENDANT.

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

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

1 minutes out, five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's
3 rule which states PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members cannot leave the work
4 premises during their rest period.

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

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

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

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

14 16. 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 premium pay,
16 by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

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

22 18. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other
23 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time penalties
24 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and based
25 thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful, such that PLAINTIFF and
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has separated are entitled to waiting time
27 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.
28

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

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

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

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

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

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

THE CALIFORNIA CLASS

25. 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 DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT 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

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

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

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

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

20 29. The CALIFORNIA CLASS, is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 Members is impracticable.

22 30. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California law
23 by:

- 24 (a) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of , Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code
25 §§ 17200, (the "UCL"), by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in
26 place company policies, practices and procedures that failed to record and pay
27 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time
28

1 worked, including minimum wages owed and overtime wages owed for work
2 performed by these employees; and,

- 3 (b) Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by failing to
4 provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
5 with the legally required meal and rest periods.

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

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

Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

- (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will create the risk of:
 - 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,
 - 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.
- (b) The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA CLASS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT failed to pay all wages due to members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS as required by law;
 - 1) With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to restitution because through this claim PLAINTIFF seeks declaratory relief holding that the DEFENDANT's policy and practices constitute unfair competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and incidental equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct declared to constitute unfair competition;

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

7 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in
8 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in
9 that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to
10 recover the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the
11 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the
12 substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this
13 litigation;

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

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

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

25 3) In the context of wage litigation because a substantial number of
26 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their
27 legal rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANT, which may
28 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.

33. 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;

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

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

18
19 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

20 35. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and
21 Ninth causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members of the CALIFORNIA
22 CLASS who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any
23 employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non exempt employees (the
24 "CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS") at any time during the period three (3) years prior to the filing
25 of the complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA LABOR
26 SUB-CLASS PERIOD") pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy for the
27 aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under five million dollars
28 (\$5,000,000.00).

1 36. DEFENDANT, in violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare
2 Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law,
3 intentionally, knowingly, and wilfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANT failed to correctly
4 calculate compensation for the time worked by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and reporting time wages owed to these employees, even though
6 DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permitted
7 or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT has denied these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
8 Members wages to which these employees are entitled in order to unfairly cheat the competition and
9 unlawfully profit. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA LABOR
10 SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD should be
11 adjusted accordingly.

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

17 38. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all
18 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

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

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

- 1 (c) Whether DEFENDANT has engaged in unfair competition by the above-listed
2 conduct;
3 (d) The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and,
5 (e) Whether DEFENDANT's conduct was willful.

6 40. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS under
7 California law by:

- 8 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the PLAINTIFF and
9 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due for
10 overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code
11 § 1194;
12 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1, by failing to accurately pay
13 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the
14 correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal.
15 Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
16 (c) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the
17 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate itemized
18 statement in writing showing the corresponding correct amount of wages earned
19 by the employee;
20 (d) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF
21 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with all
22 legally required off-duty, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the
23 legally required off-duty rest breaks;
24 (e) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an
25 employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay the
26 employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full payment
27 and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by California law to
28

1 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated
2 their employment; and,

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

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

- 8 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so
9 numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members
10 is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the
11 parties and the Court;
- 12 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that
13 are raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
14 CLASS and will apply to every member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
15 CLASS;
- 16 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
17 member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the
18 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt
19 employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANT's
20 practice and policy which failed to pay the correct amount of wages due to the
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury
22 as a result of DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the
23 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or
24 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, and unfair misconduct
25 engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,
- 26 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
27 the interest of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and has retained
28 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There

1 are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF
2 and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS that would make
3 class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
4 CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
5 CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17
18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

24 45. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code §
25 17021.

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

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

Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

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

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

17 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and fraudulent
18 in that DEFENDANT's policy and practice failed to provide the legally mandated meal and rest
19 periods, the required amount of compensation for missed meal and rest periods and overtime and
20 minimum wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed to reimburse all necessary business
21 expenses incurred, and failed to provide Fair Labor Standards Act overtime wages due for overtime
22 worked as a result of failing to include non-discretionary incentive compensation into their regular rates
23 of pay for purposes of computing the proper overtime pay due to a business practice that cannot be
24 justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in
25 violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, and for which this Court should issue injunctive and equitable
26 relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.
27
28

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 56. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to, and
28 do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which

1 DEFENDANT has acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair business practices,
3 including earned but unpaid wages for all time worked.

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

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

15
16 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

20 **and Against All Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 67. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT required,
25 permitted or suffered PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members to work without
26 paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. During the CALIFORNIA
27 LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
28

1 SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all
2 earned wages.

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

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

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

22 71. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
23 therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as
24 the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the California
25 Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined
26 to be owed to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their
27 employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these
28 individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which penalties

are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation

[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]

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

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

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

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

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

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

77. DEFENDANT's unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result of implementing a policy

1 and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
2 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other
3 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked, including, the overtime
4 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve (12) hours in a workday,
5 and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

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

1 to work, and did in fact work, overtime as to which DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay
2 as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and witnessed by employees.

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

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

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

22 85. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
23 therefore request recovery of all overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as
24 the assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the California
25 Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum and/or overtime compensation is
26 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated
27 their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore
28 these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which

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

5
6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

8 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]**

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

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

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

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

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512]

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

90. 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.

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

92. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members

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

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

7 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

9 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]**

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

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

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

- 16 (1) gross wages earned,
17 (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely
18 based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section
19 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
20 (3) the number of piecerate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on
21 a piece-rate basis,
22 (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
23 aggregated and shown as one item,
24 (5) net wages earned,
25 (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
26 (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1,
27 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification
28 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.

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

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

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

25 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

27 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

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

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

4
5 99. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

6 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
7 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
8 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.

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

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

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Failure to Pay Wages When Due**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203]**

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

5 **and Against All Defendants)**

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

9 103. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides, in relevant part, that:

10 As used in this article:

11 (a) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every
12 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
13 task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.

14 (b) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under
15 contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the labor to be
16 paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

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

19 105. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

20 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
21 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
22 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her
23 intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the
24 time of quitting. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who
25 quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by
26 mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. The date of the
27 mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to
28 provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

106. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
CLASS Members' employment contract.

107. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

108. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
Members has terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by
law. Additionally, at all times during the term of PLAINTIFF's employment with DEFENDANT,

1 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members earned and accrued vested vacation
2 and holiday time on the date of their termination pursuant to DEFENDANT's uniform vacation policies
3 and applicable California law. The amount of vacation pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA
4 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members earned and accumulated is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
5 records. Additionally, DEFENDANT also underpaid accrued vested vacation wages to PLAINTIFF and
6 other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate
7 of pay and more specifically the final rate of pay that included all non-discretionary incentive
8 compensation. Rather than pay vacation wages at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid
9 vacation wages to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members at their base
10 rates of pay, instead of including all of PLAINTIFF's and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
11 Members' non-discretionary incentive compensation into the vacation wage payment calculations.
12 DEFENDANT failed to specify in DEFENDANT's written vacation policy the rate at which
13 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR CLASS Members would be paid vacation upon leaving
14 employment with DEFENDANT. As a result of DEFENDANT's unlawful practice, policy and
15 procedure to deny paying the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
16 CLASS all of their vested vacation and holiday time, DEFENDANT failed to pay the PLAINTIFF and
17 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all vested vacation time as wages due upon
18 employment termination, in violation of the California Labor Code, Sections 201, 202, 203 and 227.3.
19 Similarly, DEFENDANT underpaid waiting time penalties to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
20 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members at their base rates of pay, instead of including all of PLAINTIFF's' and
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members' non-discretionary compensation into the waiting time
22 penalty calculations. This failure by DEFENDANT is believed to be the result of DEFENDANT's
23 unlawful, unfair and deceptive refusal to provide compensation for earned, accrued and vested vacation
24 and holiday time, as well as the corresponding waiting time penalties that were paid. DEFENDANT
25 perpetrated this unlawful, unfair and deceptive practice to the detriment of the PLAINTIFF and the
26 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS . DEFENDANT's uniform practice and policy of
27 failing to pay the LABOR SUB-CLASS Members for all vested vacation and holiday time accumulated
28

1 at employment termination violated and continues to violate Section 227.3 of the California Labor
2 Code.

3 109. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of himself and the
4 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has terminated and who have
5 not been fully paid their wages due to them, PLAINTIFF demands thirty days of pay as penalty for not
6 paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who terminated employment during the
7 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD and demands an accounting and payment of all wages
8 due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

9 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12
13 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

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

118. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to himself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of April 19, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

119. On April 19, 2024, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein (PAGA Notice only without draft complaint). The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

120. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages, (d) failed to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for required expenses, (f) failed to provide wages when due, and (g) failed to provide suitable seating, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in 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, 2100 et seq., 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct. PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

4 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

5 A) That the Court certify the First Cause of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as
6 a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;

7 B) An order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining and restraining
8 DEFENDANT from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;

9 C) An order requiring DEFENDANT to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully withheld from
10 compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
11 and,

12 D) Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT's ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund for
13 restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to PLAINTIFF and to
14 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

19 B) Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for
20 minimum and overtime compensation due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
21 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
22 CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;

23 C) The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which
24 a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA
25 LABOR SUB-CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an
26 aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for violation of
27 Cal. Lab. Code § 226;
28

- 1 D) Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the
2 applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 3 E) For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code Sections 1194.2 and 1197;
- 4 F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
5 SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.; and,
- 6 G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a
7 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
8 commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

9 3. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES:

- 10 A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act
11 of 2004; and
- 12 B) An award of attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not
13 limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

14 4. On behalf of all claims:

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

19
20 Dated: December 17, 2025 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
21
22

23 By: /s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw

24 Norman B. Blumenthal
Nicholas J. De Blouw

25 **GOMEZ TRIAL ATTORNEYS, APLC**

26 John Gomez (State Bar #171485)
655 Broadway, 17th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101

27 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
28

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

Dated: December 17, 2025 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

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

GOMEZ TRIAL ATTORNEYS, APLC
John Gomez (State Bar #171485)
655 Broadway, 17th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101

Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

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

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:

Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:

1004

April 19, 2024

CA3277

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Body Fit Plus Inc.
Certified Mail #9589071052700298440943
SIVA KONATHAM
4900 HOPYARD ROAD, SUITE 100
PLEASANTON, CA 94588

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

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Body Fit Plus Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Body Fit Plus Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of April 19, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Jose Miguel Gastelum (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Body Fit Plus Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from January 2022 to August 2023. Plaintiff was 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.