

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884)
Andrea Amaya Silva (State Bar #348080)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com
aamaya@jcl-lawfirm.com

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
9/17/2024 5:04:09 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By L. McAlister ,Deputy Clerk

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
5440 Morehouse Dr., Ste 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

MANUEL VIDRIO, an individual, on behalf of
himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HARVEST SHERWOOD FOOD
DISTRIBUTORS, INC., a Delaware
corporation; HARVEST MEAT COMPANY,
INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 37-2022-00039626-CU-OE-CTL

**FIRST AMENDED 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, *et seq*;
- 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;

- 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
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
 - 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.
 - 8) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT LABOR CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF MANUEL VIDRIO (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

1. Defendant HARVEST SHERWOOD FOOD DISTRIBUTORS, INC. (“Defendant Harvest Sherwood”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. Defendant HARVEST MEAT COMPANY, INC. (“Defendant Harvest Meat”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

3. Defendant Harvest Sherwood and Defendant Harvest Meat were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

4. DEFENDANT stocks retailers including bakery, deli, meat, and seafood departments throughout the state of California, including the county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

5. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from July of 1995 to July of 2020 as a non-exempt employee, paid 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.

1 6. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
2 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Harvest Sherwood
3 and/or Defendant Harvest Meat in California and classified as non-exempt truck drivers (the
4 “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing
5 of the original Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS
6 PERIOD”). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

19 8. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
20 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
21 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious
22 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this First
23 Amended Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when
24 they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and
25 belief alleges, that the DEFENDANTS named in this First Amended Complaint, including DOES
26 1 through 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and
27 happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.
28

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

9 10. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers or persons acting on behalf of the
10 PLAINTIFF'S employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or
11 caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision
12 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as
13 such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558,
14 at all relevant times.

15 11. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers or persons acting on behalf of
16 PLAINTIFF'S employer either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person,
17 within the meaning of California Labor Code § 1197.1, who paid or caused to be paid to any
18 employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by California state law, and as such, are subject to
19 civil penalties for each underpaid employee.

20 12. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
21 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continue to retain
22 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

23 13. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
24 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
25 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by
26 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
27 relief.

28 ///

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

14. 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.

15. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this County, and committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

16. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, and failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate and/or failing to adhere to Labor Code § 226(a)(1)-(9). DEFENDANT’s uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the

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

3 **A. Meal Period Violations**

4 17. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
5 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
6 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
7 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
8 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work
9 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically,
10 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be
11 PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not
12 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
14 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
15 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
17 records.

18 18. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
19 schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
21 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for
23 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
24 DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second
25 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT
26 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-
28 duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call.
2 Further, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
3 maintain cordless communication devices on them during meal periods in order to receive and
4 respond to work-related communications. DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and
5 the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by
6 DEFENDANT's business records. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
8 DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

9 **B. Rest Period Violations**

10 19. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
12 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
13 DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
14 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
15 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some
16 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and
17 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
18 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
19 CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. Further,
20 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to maintain
21 cordless communication devices on them during rest periods in order to receive and respond to
22 work-related communications. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also
23 not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and
24 DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
25 were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's
26 managers.

27
28 ///

1 **C. Wage Statement Violations**

2 20. California Labor Code Section 226 required an employer to furnish its employees
3 and accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
4 worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions,
5 (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
6 name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security number or an
7 employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of
8 the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
9 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

10 21. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for
12 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also
13 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and
14 accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours
15 worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding
16 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
17 meal and rest periods.

18 22. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
19 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
20 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

21 23. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and other members of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,
23 DEFENDANT's violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional
24 payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

25 **D. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

26 24. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
27 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 for all hours worked.

1 25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
2 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
3 work, including but not limited to, pre-shift and post-shift truck inspections, waiting to be relieved
4 from driving routes, and traveling between job locations. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other
5 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

6 26. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
7 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

8 27. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
9 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

11 28. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
12 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
13 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
14 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

15 29. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-
16 exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

17 30. DEFENDANT's policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed
19 for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than
21 eight (8) hours per day, DEFENDANT's policies and practices also deprived them of overtime
22 pay.

23 31. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
24 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

25 32. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
26 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and
27 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and
28 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all

1 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
2 records.

3 **E. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**
4 **and Redeemed Sick Pay**

5 33. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
6 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
7 Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
8 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
9 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
10 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
11 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at
12 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
13 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
14 records.

15 34. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
16 their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
17 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
18 employee's performance.

19 35. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid
21 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for
22 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
23 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
24 DEFENDANTS.

25 36. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay
26 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double
27 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
28 discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus

1 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
2 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
3 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
4 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
5 CLASS members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted
6 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
7 premiums, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members by
8 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time
9 for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
10 workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee
11 actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as articulated herein, by
12 failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of
13 sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is
14 recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

15 37. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
16 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
17 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
18 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
19 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay.
20 This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment
21 of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
22 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an
23 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
24 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANT, the
25 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

26 **F. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

27 38. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their

1 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
2 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
3 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

4 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

5 39. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
6 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do
7 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
8 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

9 40. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
10 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
11 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)
12 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
13 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required
14 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF
15 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
16 DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
17 supposed to be his off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
18 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT'S strict corporate policy
19 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to
20 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. To date, DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the
21 minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to him or any penalty wages owed
22 to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does
23 not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

24 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

25 41. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of himself, and a California class
26 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Harvest Sherwood
27 and/or Defendant Harvest Meat in California and classified as non-exempt truck drivers (the
28 "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing

1 of the original Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS
2 PERIOD”).

3 42. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have uniformly been
4 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to
5 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,
6 illegal meal and rest period policies, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failed compensate
7 for off-the-clock work, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to maintain
8 required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and expenses.

9 43. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
10 impractical.

11 44. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANT’s conduct, including
12 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to accurately
13 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately calculate the
14 regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failing to provide legally
15 compliant meal and rest periods, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide
16 accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum
17 wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions
18 affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact
19 common to the class are:

- 20 a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
21 practices;
 - 22 b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
23 practices;
 - 24 c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
25 Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
 - 26 d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
27 Members accurate overtime wages;
- 28

- e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- f. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- g. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to permit this work;
- i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

45. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

46. PLAINTIFF'S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

47. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

48. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action litigation.

49. Further, PLAINTIFF'S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

50. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained.

51. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual issues relating to liability and damages.

52. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all class members is impractical. Moreover, since the damages suffered by individual members of the class may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation makes it practically impossible for the members of the class individually to redress the wrongs done to them. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory, and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will create the risk of:

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

53. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Business Practices

(Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

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

1 55. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.
2 Code § 17021.

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

7 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may
8 be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such orders or
9 judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the
10 use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair competition, as
defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any
money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such
unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203).

11 57. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
12 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
13 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
14 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198,
15 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. &
16 Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute
17 unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

23 59. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were deceptive and
24 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
25 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and
26 rest periods, failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, and failed to reimburse all
27 necessary business expenses incurred, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be
28 justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission

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

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

8 61. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
9 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
10 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
11 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

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

17 63. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was
19 not timely provided as required by law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

21 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1)**

22 **Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against ALL Defendants)**

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

26 70. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
27 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 77. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
26 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
27 minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

28 ///

1 78. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
3 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

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

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

24 82. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request
25 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
26 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
27 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage
28 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have

1 terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or
2 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab.
3 Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS
4 Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good
5 faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and
6 recover statutory costs.

7 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

10 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against ALL Defendants)**

11 83. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
12 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this First
13 Amended Complaint.

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

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

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

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

28 ///

1 88. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
2 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time
3 they worked, including overtime work.

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

11 90. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
12 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
13 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal
14 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
15 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
16 regulations.

17 91. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
18 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
19 overtime compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

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
22 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
23 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining
24 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this First Amended
25 Complaint. Rather, PLAINTIFF bring this Action on behalf of himself, and the CALIFORNIA
26 CLASS, based on DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided
27 by the State of California.

28 ///

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

4 94. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
6 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, & 1198, even
7 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were regularly required
8 to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which DEFENDANT
9 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
10 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 CLASS for the true
13 amount of overtime they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are
15 presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

16 96. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
17 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.
18 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
19 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
20 procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF
21 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for their
22 overtime worked.

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

1 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
2 these employees.

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

13 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

15 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

16 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

17 99. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
18 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this First
19 Amended Complaint.

20 100. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
21 required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members as
22 required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by
23 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members did not prevent these employees from being
24 relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their
25 rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often not
26 fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT's
27 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required
28 meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business

1 records. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were
3 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
4 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation
5 and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

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

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

14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

16 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

17 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

18 103. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
19 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this First
20 Amended Complaint.

21 104. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
22 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
23 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
24 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)
25 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and
26 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.
27 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour
28 wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by
2 DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. In addition, DEFENDANT failed to compensate
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as required by the
4 applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide
5 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid rest
6 periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

15 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

17 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

18 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

19 107. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
20 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this First
21 Amended Complaint.

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

- 24 a. Gross wages earned,
- 25 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
- 26 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
- 27 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
- 28 Industrial Welfare Commission,

- c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- i. 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. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

110. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

111. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct

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

9 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

12 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

16 113. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

17 As used in this article:

- 18 (d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every
19 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
20 task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.
21 (e) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under
22 contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the to be
23 paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

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

27 115. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

28 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and

designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

116. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF'S or any CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' employment contract.

117. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

118. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

119. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of himself and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has, PLAINTIFF demand up to thirty (30) days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who terminated employment during the CLASS PERIOD and demand an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF against all Defendants)

120. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this First Amended Complaint.

121. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who does so as the proxy or agent of the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting

1 PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved
2 employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations
3 ..." (Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1). Accordingly, representative PAGA claims cannot be subject to
4 arbitration.

5 122. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
6 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
7 Act, bring this individual and Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with
8 respect to himself and all non-exempt employees who worked for DEFENDANTS in California
9 during the time period of September 15, 2022 until the present (the "AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES").

11 123. On September 15, 2023, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by certified mail to the
12 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the specific
13 provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See
14 Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting
15 period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result,
16 pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence an individual and representative
17 civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with
18 respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

19 124. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
20 business act or practice because DEFENDANTS (a) failed to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
21 EMPLOYEES minimum wages and overtime wages, (b) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
22 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES legally required meal and rest breaks, (c) failed to pay PLAINTIFF
23 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct regular rate of pay, (d) failed to pay PLAINTIFF
24 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, and (e) failed to timely pay wages, all in
25 violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §2699.5, including but not
26 limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3,
27 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2804,
28 and the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to statutory penalties as a

1 result of such conduct. PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the
2 Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California
3 for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF pray for a judgment against each Defendant, jointly and
6 severally, as follows:

7 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

18 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 19 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Causes
20 of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal.
21 Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
22 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
23 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of
24 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest
25 thereon at the statutory rate;
26 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
27 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
28 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in

1 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding
3 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for
4 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226

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

8 f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
9 CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.

10 3. On behalf of PLAINTIFF as an individual and the State of California and with respect
11 to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES: Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the
12 Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004.

13 4. On all claims:

14 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;

15 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and

16 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
17 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, and/or § 1194.

18
19 DATED: September 17, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

20
21 By: 
22 Shani O. Zakay
23 Attorney for PLAINTIFF
24
25
26
27
28

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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: September 17, 2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 
Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Client # 54701

September 15, 2023

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendants

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Online Filing

HARVEST SHERWOOD FOOD DISTRIBUTORS, INC.

HARVEST MEAT COMPANY, INC.

c/o McDermott Will & Emery LLP

Yesenia Gallegos, Esq.

Laurie Baddon, Esq.

vgallegos@mwe.com

lbaddon@mwe.com

Via Electronic Mail

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, and 1199, Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Our offices represent Plaintiff MANUEL VIDRIO (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a lawsuit against Defendant HARVEST SHERWOOD FOOD DISTRIBUTORS, INC. (“Defendant Harvest Sherwood”) and Defendant HARVEST MEAT COMPANY, INC. (“Defendant Harvest Meat”) (collectively “Defendants”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendants since July of 1995 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to payment of all wages and the legally required meal and rest breaks. Defendants, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all of their time worked, and for all of their meal breaks and rest breaks. Further, Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for earned wages.

As a consequence of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff further contends that Defendants failed to provide accurate wage statements to him and other aggrieved employees, which among other violations of California Labor Code section 226(a). Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, and 1199, violates the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant Harvest Sherwood and/or Defendant Harvest Meat in California during the relevant claim period.

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendants, which (1) identifies the alleged violations, (2) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (3) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (4) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (5) sets forth the

illegal practices used by Defendants, 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.

To the extent that entities and/or individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code Sections including, but not limited to 558, 558.1, and 1197.1—Plaintiff reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue.

Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this notice. Consequently, Defendants are on notice that Plaintiff continues his investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendants as authorized by California Labor Code section 2695, *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 California 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.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Shani O. Zakay', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
5440 Morehouse Dr., Ste 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291
jlapyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

MANUEL VIDRIO, an individual, on behalf of
himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HARVEST SHERWOOD FOOD
DISTRIBUTORS, INC., a Delaware
corporation; HARVEST MEAT COMPANY,
INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 37-2022-00039626-CU-OE-CTL

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, *et seq*;
- 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;

- 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
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN
VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF MANUEL VIDRIO (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

1. Defendant HARVEST SHERWOOD FOOD DISTRIBUTORS, INC. (“Defendant Harvest Sherwood”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. Defendant HARVEST MEAT COMPANY, INC. (“Defendant Harvest Meat”) is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

3. Defendant Harvest Sherwood and Defendant Harvest Meat were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as “DEFENDANTS” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

4. DEFENDANT stocks retailers including bakery, deli, meat, and seafood departments throughout the state of California, including the county of San Diego, where PLAINTIFF worked.

5. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT in California since July of 1995 as a non-exempt employee, paid 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.

///

1 6. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
2 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Harvest Sherwood
3 and/or Defendant Harvest Meat in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the
4 “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing
5 of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).
6 The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is
7 under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

28 ///

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

9 10. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers or persons acting on behalf of the
10 PLAINTIFF'S employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or
11 caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision
12 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as
13 such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558,
14 at all relevant times.

15 11. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers or persons acting on behalf of
16 PLAINTIFF'S employer either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person,
17 within the meaning of California Labor Code § 1197.1, who paid or caused to be paid to any
18 employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by California state law, and as such, are subject to
19 civil penalties for each underpaid employee.

20 12. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
21 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continue to retain
22 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

23 13. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
24 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
25 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by
26 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
27 relief.

28 ///

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

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

6
7
8
9

10

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **A. Meal Period Violations**

2 17. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
3 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
4 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
5 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
6 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work
7 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically,
8 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be
9 PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not
10 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
12 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
13 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
15 records.

16 18. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work
17 schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty
19 meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for
21 more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further,
22 DEFENDANT fails to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second
23 off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees are required by DEFENDANT
24 to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-
26 duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call.
28 Further, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to

1 maintain cordless communication devices on them during meal periods in order to receive and
2 respond to work-related communications. DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and
3 the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by
4 DEFENDANT's business records. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
5 therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
6 DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

7 **B. Rest Period Violations**

8 19. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
10 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
11 DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied
12 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
13 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some
14 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and
15 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
16 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
17 CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. Further,
18 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to maintain
19 cordless communication devices on them during rest periods in order to receive and respond to
20 work-related communications. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also
21 not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and
22 DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
23 were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's
24 managers.

25 **C. Wage Statement Violations**

26 20. California Labor Code Section 226 required an employer to furnish its employees
27 and accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours
28 worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions,

1 (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
2 name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security number or an
3 employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of
4 the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
5 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

6 21. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for
8 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also
9 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and
10 accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours
11 worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding
12 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
13 meal and rest periods.

14 22. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
15 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
16 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

17 23. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further,
19 DEFENDANT's violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional
20 payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

21 **D. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

22 24. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
23 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 for all hours worked.

25 25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
26 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
27 work, including but not limited to, pre-shift and post-shift truck inspections, waiting to be relieved
28

1 from driving routes, and traveling between job locations. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other
2 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

3 26. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
4 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

5 27. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
6 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

8 28. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
9 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
10 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
11 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

12 29. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were non-
13 exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

14 30. DEFENDANT's policies and practices deprived PLAINTIFF and the other
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed
16 for the off-the-clock work activities. Because PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than
18 eight (8) hours per day, DEFENDANT's policies and practices also deprived them of overtime
19 pay.

20 31. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
21 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

22 32. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and
24 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and
25 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all
26 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
27 records.

28 ///

1 **E. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**
2 **and Redeemed Sick Pay**

3 33. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
4 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
5 Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
6 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
7 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
8 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
9 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at
10 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
11 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
12 records.

13 34. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
14 their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
15 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
16 employee's performance.

17 35. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid
19 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for
20 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
21 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
22 DEFENDANTS.

23 36. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay
24 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double
25 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
26 discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
27 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
28 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the

1 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
2 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS members must be included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted
4 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
5 premiums, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members by
6 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time
7 for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
8 workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee
9 actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS’ conduct, as articulated herein, by
10 failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the “regular rate of pay” for purposes of
11 sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is
12 recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

13 37. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
14 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
15 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
16 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
17 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay.
18 This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANT is intended to purposefully avoid the payment
19 of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick
20 pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain an
21 unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
22 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS members against DEFENDANT, the
23 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

24 **F. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

25 38. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
27 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
28

1 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
2 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

3 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

4 39. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
5 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do
6 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result,
7 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

8 40. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
9 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
10 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)
11 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
12 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required
13 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF
14 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
15 DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
16 supposed to be his off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
17 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT'S strict corporate policy
18 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to
19 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does
20 not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

21 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

22 41. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of himself, and a California class
23 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Harvest Sherwood
24 and/or Defendant Harvest Meat in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the
25 "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing
26 of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD").

27 42. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have uniformly been
28 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to

1 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,
2 illegal meal and rest period policies, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failed compensate
3 for off-the-clock work, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to maintain
4 required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and expenses.

5 43. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
6 impractical.

7 44. Common questions of law and fact regarding DEFENDANT's conduct, including
8 but not limited to, off-the-clock work, unpaid meal and rest period premiums, failure to accurately
9 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime compensation, failure to accurately calculate the
10 regular rate of compensation for missed meal and rest period premiums, failing to provide legally
11 compliant meal and rest periods, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failure to provide
12 accurate itemized wage statements accurate, and failure to ensure they are paid at least minimum
13 wage and overtime, exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions
14 affecting solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact
15 common to the class are:

- 16 a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
17 practices;
18 b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
19 practices;
20 c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
21 Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
22 d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 Members accurate overtime wages;
24 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
25 Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
26 f. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
27
28

///

1 g. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
2 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
3 CLASS for all time worked;

4 h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
5 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit
7 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
8 permit this work;

9 i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the
10 UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

12 45. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
13 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

14 46. PLAINTIFF'S claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
15 PLAINTIFF have the same interests as the other members of the class.

16 47. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

18 48. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
19 litigation.

20 49. Further, PLAINTIFF'S interests are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the
21 interest of the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

22 50. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of
23 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are
24 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
25 sustained.

26 51. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
27 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual
28 issues relating to liability and damages.

52. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all class members is impractical. Moreover, since the damages suffered by individual members of the class may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation makes it practically impossible for the members of the class individually to redress the wrongs done to them. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory, and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will create the risk of:

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

53. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANT.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Business Practices

(Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)

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

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

/ / /

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

5 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may
6 be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such orders or
7 judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the
8 use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair competition, as
defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any
money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such
unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203).

9 57. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
10 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
11 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
12 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198,
13 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. &
14 Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute
15 unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

21 59. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were deceptive and
22 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
23 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and
24 rest periods, failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, and failed to reimburse all
25 necessary business expenses incurred, due to a systematic business practice that cannot be
26 justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission
27 requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should
28

1 issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including
2 restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

7 61. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
8 deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
9 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
10 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

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

16 63. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was
18 not timely provided as required by law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

21 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1)**

22 **Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against ALL Defendants)**

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

26 70. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
27 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 77. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
26 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
27 minimum wage compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

28 ///

1 78. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
3 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

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

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

24 82. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request
25 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
26 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
27 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent minimum wage
28 compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have

1 terminated their employment, DEFENDANT's conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or
2 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab.
3 Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these CALIFORNIA CLASS
4 Members. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good
5 faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are entitled to seek and
6 recover statutory costs.

7 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

10 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against ALL Defendants)**

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

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

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

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

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

28 ///

1 88. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
2 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time
3 they worked, including overtime work.

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

11 90. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
12 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
13 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal
14 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
15 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
16 regulations.

17 91. As a direct result of DEFENDANT's unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
18 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS did not receive the correct
19 overtime compensation for their time worked for DEFENDANT.

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
22 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
23 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining
24 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather,
25 PLAINTIFF bring this Action on behalf of himself, and the CALIFORNIA CLASS, based on
26 DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
27 California.

28 ///

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

4 94. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
6 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, & 1198, even
7 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were regularly required
8 to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which DEFENDANT
9 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
10 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 CLASS for the true
13 amount of overtime they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are
15 presently unknown to them, and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

16 96. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
17 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.
18 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
19 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
20 procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF
21 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for their
22 overtime worked.

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

1 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
2 these employees.

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

13 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

15 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

16 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

20 100. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to provide all the legally
21 required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members as
22 required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of the work performed by
23 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members did not prevent these employees from being
24 relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-duty meal periods. As a result of their
25 rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often not
26 fully relieved of duty by DEFENDANT for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANT's
27 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required
28 meal breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business

1 records. Further, DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members with a second off-duty meal period in some workdays in which these employees were
3 required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
4 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation
5 and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

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

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

14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

16 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

17 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

21 104. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
22 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
23 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
24 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)
25 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and
26 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.
27 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour
28 wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by
2 DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. In addition, DEFENDANT failed to compensate
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as required by the
4 applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide
5 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid rest
6 periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

15 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

17 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

18 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

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

- 24 a. Gross wages earned,
- 25 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
26 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
27 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
28 Industrial Welfare Commission,

- c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- i. 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. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

110. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

111. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct

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

9 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

12 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all Defendants)**

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

16 113. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

17 As used in this article:

- 18 (d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every
19 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
20 task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.
21 (e) "Labor" includes labor, work, or service whether rendered or performed under
22 contract, subcontract, partnership, station plan, or other agreement if the to be
23 paid for is performed personally by the person demanding payment.

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

27 115. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

28 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and

designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

116. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF'S or any CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' employment contract.

117. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

118. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA CLASS Members terminated, and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of wages to these employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

119. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of himself and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS whose employment has, PLAINTIFF demand up to thirty (30) days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination for all employees who terminated employment during the CLASS PERIOD and demand an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory costs as allowed by law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

1 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANT's violations due to
2 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

3 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

28 ///

3. On all claims:

- a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, and/or § 1194.

DATED: September __, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: _____

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: September __, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: _____

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for PLAINTIFF