

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

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

**Web Site: [www.bamlawca.com](http://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](mailto:Nick@bamlawca.com)**

**WRITERS EXT:  
1004**

**July 8, 2024  
CA3333**

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

**Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
Online Filing**

**Maxar Intelligence Inc.  
Certified Mail #9589071052701151772638  
CT Corporation System  
AMANDA GARCIA  
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700  
GLENDALE, CA 91203**

**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 Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 8, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Drake Schmitt (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California since October 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs.,

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw*  
Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

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

Web Site: [www.bamlawca.com](http://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](mailto:Nick@bamlawca.com)

WRITERS EXT:  
1004

July 8, 2024  
CA3333

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
Online Filing

Maxar Mission Solutions Inc.  
Certified Mail #9589071052701151772645  
CT Corporation System  
AMANDA GARCIA  
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700  
GLENDALE, CA 91203

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 Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 8, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Drake Schmitt (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California since October 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs.,

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw*  
Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

2255 CALLE CLARA  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: [www.bamlawca.com](http://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](mailto:Nick@bamlawca.com)

WRITERS EXT:  
1004

July 8, 2024  
CA3333

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
Online Filing

Maxar Space Holdings LLC  
Certified Mail #9589071052701151772607  
CT Corporation System  
AMANDA GARCIA  
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700  
GLENDALE, CA 91203

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 Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 8, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Drake Schmitt (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California since October 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs.,

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw*  
Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

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

**Web Site: [www.bamlawca.com](http://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](mailto:Nick@bamlawca.com)**

**WRITERS EXT:  
1004**

**July 8, 2024  
CA3333**

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

**Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
Online Filing**

**Maxar Space LLC  
Certified Mail #958907105270115177261 4  
CT Corporation System  
AMANDA GARCIA  
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700  
GLENDALE, CA 91203**

**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 Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 8, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Drake Schmitt (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California since October 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs.,

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw*  
Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

2255 CALLE CLARA  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: [www.bamlawca.com](http://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](mailto:Nick@bamlawca.com)

WRITERS EXT:  
1004

July 8, 2024  
CA3333

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
Online Filing

Maxar Space Robotics LLC  
Certified Mail #9589071052701151772652  
CT Corporation System  
AMANDA GARCIA  
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700  
GLENDALE, CA 91203

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 Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 8, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Drake Schmitt (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California since October 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs.,

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw*  
Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

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

**Web Site: [www.bamlawca.com](http://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](mailto:Nick@bamlawca.com)**

**WRITERS EXT:  
1004**

**July 8, 2024  
CA3333**

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

**Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
Online Filing**

**Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc.  
Certified Mail #95890710527011517772621  
CT Corporation System  
AMANDA GARCIA  
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700  
GLENDALE, CA 91203**

**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 Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 8, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Drake Schmitt (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California since October 2022. Plaintiff is at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs.,

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw*  
Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

2 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

3 Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

2255 Calle Clara

4 La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

5 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: [www.bamlawca.com](http://www.bamlawca.com)

6 Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

7 *[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]*

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

9 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

10 DRAKE SCHMITT, an individual, on behalf of  
11 himself and on behalf of all persons similarly  
12 situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 MAXAR SPACE LLC, a limited liability  
16 company; MAXAR INTELLIGENCE  
17 INC., a corporation; MAXAR  
MISSION SOLUTIONS INC., a corporation;  
18 MAXAR TECHNOLOGIES  
HOLDINGS INC., a corporation; MAXAR  
19 SPACE HOLDINGS LLC, a limited liability  
company; MAXAR SPACE ROBOTICS LLC,  
20 a limited liability company; and DOES 1  
through 50, inclusive,

21 Defendants.

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
2. FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
3. FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 510;
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;
- and,
8. FAILURE TO PAY SICK PAY WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB CODE §§201-204, 233, 246.

**DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

4  
5 **THE PARTIES**

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

8 2. Maxar Intelligence Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein  
9 conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

10 3. Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned  
11 herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

12 4. Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times  
13 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

14 5. Maxar Space Holdings LLC is a limited liability company that at all relevant times  
15 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

16 6. Maxar Space Robotics LLC is a limited liability company that at all relevant times  
17 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

18 7. Maxar Space LLC, Maxar Intelligence Inc., Maxar Mission Solutions Inc., Maxar  
19 Technologies Holdings Inc., Maxar Space Holdings LLC, and Maxar Space Robotics LLC are  
20 the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by paycheck and by the company PLAINTIFF  
21 performed work for respectively, and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the  
22 conduct alleged herein, and are therefore collectively referred to herein as ("DEFENDANT").

23 8. DEFENDANT owns and operates a geospatial intelligence company in California.

24 9. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT in California since October  
25 2022. PLAINTIFF is at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid  
26 on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of  
27 minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

28 10. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,

1 defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by Maxar Space LLC and/or  
2 Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies  
3 Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC in  
4 California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence  
5 Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or  
6 Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a third party, and classified  
7 as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period  
8 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as  
9 determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy  
10 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars  
11 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

23 12. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,  
24 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are  
25 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious  
26 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this  
27 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when  
28 they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believe, and based upon that information

1 and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through  
2 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings  
3 that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

### 12 13 **THE CONDUCT**

14 14. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT  
15 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time  
16 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an  
17 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.  
18 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without  
19 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,  
20 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to  
21 be PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by  
22 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal  
23 break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers  
24 a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and  
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the  
26 course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are paid less  
27 than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than  
28 "rounded" time. Additionally, DEFENDANT engages in the practice of requiring

1 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work off the clock in that  
2 DEFENDANT, as a condition of employment, required these employees to submit to  
3 mandatory temperature checks and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior  
4 to clocking into DEFENDANT's timekeeping system for the workday. As a result,  
5 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeit minimum wage, overtime  
6 wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly  
7 recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and  
8 practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time  
9 worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

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

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

1 over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose  
2 controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes  
3 back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA  
4 CLASS Members from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule  
5 which states PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members cannot leave the work  
6 premises during their rest period.

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

23 20. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the  
24 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements  
25 which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab.  
26 Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an  
27 accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages  
28 earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding

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

15 21. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be  
16 deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if  
17 the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll  
18 period. Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

19 in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided  
20 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in  
21 Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial  
22 violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee; (2) For  
23 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars  
24 (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount  
25 unlawfully withheld.

26 22. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and members of  
27 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members within seven (7) days of the close of the  
28 payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to for  
the “Hourly” regular wage payments.

23. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and other  
CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in

1 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt  
2 employees earn non-discretionary remuneration. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate  
3 of pay, DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS  
4 Members at their base rates of pay.

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

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

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

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

1 employees all wages due at each applicable pay period and upon termination. PLAINTIFF  
2 and members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS seek recovery of all illegal  
3 deductions from wages according to proof, related penalties, interest, attorney fees and costs.

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

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

25 30. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
26 requirements of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order,  
27 DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally,  
28 knowingly and systematically failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other Aggrieved

1 Employees suitable seating when the nature of these employees' work reasonably permitted  
2 sitting.

3 31. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and other  
4 Aggrieved Employees were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit when it did  
5 not interfere with the performance of their duties, and that DEFENDANT did not provide  
6 suitable seating and/or did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with the  
7 performance of their duties.

8 32. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all Aggrieved  
9 Employees, DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code Section 1198 and California  
10 Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Wage Order  
11 4-2001, Section 14 by failing to provide suitable seats. PLAINTIFF seeks penalties on  
12 behalf of PLAINTIFF and other Aggrieved Employees as provided herein. Providing  
13 suitable seating is the DEFENDANT's burden. As a result of DEFENDANT's intentional  
14 disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT violated the California Labor  
15 Code and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

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

27 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**  
28

34. 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.

35. 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

36. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (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 Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 42. This Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a  
7 Class 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  
9 that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition  
10 of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;  
11 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief  
12 issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the  
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS will apply to every member of the  
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS;  
15 (c) The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims  
16 of each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all  
17 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, was classified as a  
18 non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who was subjected to the  
19 DEFENDANT's deceptive practice and policy which failed to provide  
20 the legally required meal and rest periods to the CALIFORNIA CLASS  
21 and thereby underpaid compensation to PLAINTIFF and  
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as a  
23 result of DEFENDANT's employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the  
24 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or  
25 identically harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive and unfair  
26 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANT; and,  
27 (d) The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent  
28 and protect the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained

1 counsel who are competent and experienced in Class Action litigation.  
2 There are no material conflicts between the claims of the representative  
3 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that  
4 would make class certification inappropriate. Counsel for the  
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all  
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

9 (a) Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive,  
10 statutory and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution  
11 of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA  
12 CLASS will create the risk of:

13 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual  
14 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS which would establish  
15 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the  
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and/or,

17 2) Adjudication with respect to individual members of the  
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS which would as a practical matter be  
19 dispositive of interests of the other members not party to the  
20 adjudication or substantially impair or impede their ability to  
21 protect their interests.

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

27 1) With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on  
28 behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate

1 exclusively to restitution because through this claim  
2 PLAINTIFF seeks declaratory relief holding that the  
3 DEFENDANT's policy and practices constitute unfair  
4 competition, along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and  
5 incidental equitable relief as may be necessary to prevent and  
6 remedy the conduct declared to constitute unfair competition;

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

- 13 1) The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in  
14 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate  
15 actions in that the substantial expense of individual actions will  
16 be avoided to recover the relatively small amount of economic  
17 losses sustained by the individual CALIFORNIA CLASS  
18 Members when compared to the substantial expense and burden  
19 of individual prosecution of this litigation;
- 20 2) Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative  
21 litigation that would create the risk of:
  - 22 A. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to  
23 individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which  
24 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the  
25 DEFENDANT; and/or,
  - 26 B. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the  
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS would as a practical matter be  
28 dispositive of the interests of the other members not

parties to the adjudication or substantially impair or  
impede their ability to protect their interests;

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

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

44. 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;

- 1 (c) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that it is  
2 impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS before  
3 the Court;
- 4 (d) PLAINTIFF , and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, will not  
5 be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action  
6 is maintained as a Class Action;
- 7 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and  
8 equitable relief for the acts of unfair competition, statutory violations  
9 and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the  
10 damages and injuries which DEFENDANT's actions have inflicted  
11 upon the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 12 (f) There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of  
13 DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of  
14 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- 15 (g) DEFENDANT has acted or refused to act on grounds generally  
16 applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-  
17 wide relief appropriate with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a  
18 whole;
- 19 (h) The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable  
20 from the business records of DEFENDANT; and,
- 21 (i) Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to  
22 bring a efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and  
23 hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT as to  
24 the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

3  
4 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

5 46. PLAINTIFF further brings the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh,  
6 Eighth and Ninth causes Action on behalf of a California sub-class, defined as all members  
7 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who are or previously were employed by Maxar Space LLC  
8 and/or Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar  
9 Technologies Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space  
10 Robotics LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Maxar Space LLC and/or  
11 Maxar Intelligence Inc. and/or Maxar Mission Solutions Inc. and/or Maxar Technologies  
12 Holdings Inc. and/or Maxar Space Holdings LLC and/or Maxar Space Robotics LLC by a  
13 third party, and classified as non exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-  
14 CLASS”) at any time during the period three (3) years prior to the filing of the complaint  
15 and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-  
16 CLASS PERIOD”) pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382. The amount in controversy  
17 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is under five  
18 million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

1 SUB-CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD  
2 should be adjusted accordingly.

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

8 49. The CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all  
9 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable.

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

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

25 51. DEFENDANT violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-  
26 CLASS under California law by:

- 27 (a) Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 510, by failing to correctly pay the  
28 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-

1 CLASS all wages due for overtime worked, for which DEFENDANT is  
2 liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 1194;

3 (b) Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to  
4 accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA  
5 LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum wage pay for which  
6 DEFENDANT is liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;

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

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

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

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

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

27 (a) The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS  
28 are so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-

1 CLASS Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as  
2 a class will benefit the parties and the Court;

3 (b) Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief  
4 issues that are raised in this Complaint are common to the  
5 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply to every member  
6 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;

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

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

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

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

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

1 treatment will obviate the need for unduly and unnecessary  
2 duplicative litigation that is likely to result in the absence of  
3 certification of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §  
4 382.

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

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

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

17  
18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **For Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

1 17203 authorizes injunctive, declaratory, and/or other equitable relief with respect to unfair  
2 competition as follows:

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

11 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203.

12 58. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to  
13 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the  
14 applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California  
15 Labor Code including Sections 204, 210, 221, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,  
16 1198, 2802 and the Fair Labor Standards Act and federal regulations promulgated  
17 thereunder, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant  
18 to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct  
19 held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

20 59. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were unlawful and  
21 unfair in that these practices violate public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive,  
22 unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or  
23 utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section  
24 17203 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages  
25 wrongfully withheld.

26 60. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and  
27 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's policy and practice failed to provide the legally  
28 mandated meal and rest periods, the required amount of compensation for missed meal and  
rest periods and overtime and minimum wages owed, failed to timely pay wages, and failed  
to reimburse all necessary business expenses incurred, and failed to provide Fair Labor  
Standards Act overtime wages due for overtime worked as a result of failing to include non-

1 discretionary incentive compensation into their regular rates of pay for purposes of  
2 computing the proper overtime pay due to a business practice that cannot be justified,  
3 pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements  
4 in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue  
5 injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including  
6 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

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

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

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

1           66. All the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the  
2 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, the California Code of Regulations, and the  
3 California Labor Code, were unlawful and in violation of public policy, were immoral,  
4 unethical, oppressive and unscrupulous, were deceptive, and thereby constitute unlawful,  
5 unfair and deceptive business practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et*  
6 *seq.*

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

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

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

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 implementing a policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF and  
2 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in regards to minimum  
3 wage pay.

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

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

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

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

26 81. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other  
27 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for their  
28 time worked. DEFENDANT elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross

1 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of company policy, practice  
2 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF  
3 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct minimum  
4 wages for their time worked.

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

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

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **For Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 510]**

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 89. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and  
27  
28

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

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

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

20 92. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt  
21 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to the  
22 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. Further,  
23 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were not  
24 subject to a valid collective bargaining agreement that would preclude the causes of action  
25 contained herein this Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFF brings this Action on behalf of  
26 himself and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS based on DEFENDANT's violations  
27 of non-negotiable, non-waiveable rights provided by the State of California.  
28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

16  
17 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

25 100. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT from time to time  
26 failed to provide all the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other  
27 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order  
28 and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA

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

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

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

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

9 104. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were  
10 from time to time required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten  
11 (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees from time to time were denied their first  
12 rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)  
13 hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of  
14 between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten  
15 (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time.

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

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

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

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 226]**

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

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

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

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

109. 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 rates in effect during the pay period and  
the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and

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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 ///

2  
3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

5 **[Cal. Lab. Code § 2802]**

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

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

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

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

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

1 DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver of this  
2 expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF  
3 and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify  
4 and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for  
5 these expenses as an employer is required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

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

10  
11 **EIGHTS CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **For Failure to Pay Sick Pay Wages**

13 **[ Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-204, 210, 233, 246]**

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

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

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

1 total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in  
2 the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment." Under Cal Lab. Code §§ 218 and  
3 233, employees may sue to recover underpaid sick pay wages as damages.

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

16 118. Cal. Lab. Code § 204 provides that wages generally are due and payable twice  
17 during each calendar month and are to be paid no later than the payday for the next regular  
18 payroll period. Consistent with Cal. Lab. Code § 204, Cal. Lab. Code § 246 specifically  
19 requires that, upon use of accrued sick leave, vested sick pay wages are due and to be paid  
20 no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period after accrued sick leave is used  
21 as paid sick time. Similarly, Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides that if an employer discharges  
22 an employee, wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable  
23 immediately. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides that an employee is entitled to receive all  
24 unpaid wages no later than 72 hours after an employee quits his or her employment, unless  
25 the employee has given 72-hour notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the  
26 employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. The Labor Code penalizes  
27 untimely payments. For example, Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides that if an employer  
28 willfully fails to pay wages owed in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-202, then the

1 wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date, and at the same rate  
2 until paid, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days. Likewise, Cal.  
3 Lab. Code § 210 provides penalties for violations of Cal. Lab. Code § 204 and untimely  
4 payments during employment. Under Cal. Lab. Code §§ 203, 210 and 218, employees may  
5 sue to recover applicable penalties.

6 119. As alleged herein and as a matter of policy and practice, DEFENDANT  
7 routinely underpays sick pay wages and thus did not timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other  
8 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR-SUB-CLASS all owing and underpaid sick pay  
9 wages. As a result, DEFENDANT violates Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-204, 210, 233, and 246,  
10 among other Labor Code provisions. PLAINTIFF IS informed and believes that  
11 DEFENDANT was advised by skilled lawyers and knew, or should have known, of the  
12 mandates of the Labor Code as it relates to PLAINTIFF’S allegations, especially since the  
13 California Supreme Court has explained that “[c]ourts have recognized that ‘wages’ also  
14 include those benefits to which an employee is entitled as a part of his or her compensation,  
15 including money, room, board, clothing, vacation pay, *and sick pay.*” *Murphy v. Kenneth*  
16 *Cole Prods., Inc.*, 40 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 1094, 1103 (2007)(emphasis added). Because DEFENDANT  
17 willfully fails to timely pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA  
18 LABOR-SUB-CLASS all sick pay wages due, DEFENDANT is subject to applicable  
19 penalties.

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

### 24 25 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

28 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

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

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

1 F) The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the  
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUBCLASS incurred in the course of their job duties,  
3 plus interest, and costs of suit.; and,

4 G) The wages of all terminated employees in the CALIFORNIA LABOR  
5 SUB-CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or  
6 until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

7 3. On all claims:

8 A) An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;

9 B) Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and,

10 C) An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the  
11 law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §221, §226, §1194,  
12 and/or §2802.

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

Dated: July 8, 2024            BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Norman B. Blumenthal  
Nicholas J. De Blouw

*Attorneys for PLAINTIFF*

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

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

**DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

Dated: July 8, 2024      BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Norman B. Blumenthal  
Nicholas J. De Blouw

*Attorneys for PLAINTIFF*

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