

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
julieann@zakaylaw.com

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ANDREW ELLENBERG-WILEY, an
individual, on behalf of himself, and on behalf
of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION, a
California nonprofit corporation; and DOES 1-
50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: CGC-23-609040

**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;

ELECTRONICALLY

FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

11/08/2023

Clerk of the Court

BY: WILLIAM TRUPEK

Deputy Clerk

- 1 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
2 DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
3 CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
4 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
5 ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN
6 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
7 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
8 FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN
9 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802.
10 9) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE
11 ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT LABOR
12 CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ.

13 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

14 PLAINTIFF ANDREW ELLENBERG-WILEY (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf
15 of himself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and
16 belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the
17 following:

18 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

19 1. Defendant SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION (“DEFENDANT” and/or
20 “DEFENDANTS”) is a California nonprofit corporation that at all relevant times mentioned
21 herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

22 2. DEFENDANT operates sexual health clinics throughout the state of California,
23 including in the county of San Francisco, where PLAINTIFF worked.

24 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from September
25 2021 to October of 2022 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis and entitled to the
26 legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all
27 time worked.

28 4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class,
defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and
classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period
beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of the original Complaint and ending on the date as

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

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

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

7. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the
2 Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

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

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

14 10. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
15 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continue to retain
16 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

17 11. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
18 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by
20 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
21 relief.

22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

27 13. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
28 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs

1 the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this County, and committed the
2 wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

3 **THE CONDUCT**

4 14. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
5 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
6 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically
7 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate
8 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest
9 periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
10 time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
13 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue
15 to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage
16 statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
17 periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT’s
18 uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment
19 for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit
20 and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable
21 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS
22 PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

23 **A. Meal Period Violations**

24 15. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
25 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
26 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
27 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
28 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work

1 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically,
2 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be
3 PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not
4 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
5 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
6 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
7 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
9 records.

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

27
28 ///

1 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

16 **C. Wage Statement Violations**

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

25 19. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for
27 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also
28 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and

1 accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours
2 worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding
3 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
4 meal and rest periods.

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

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

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

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

16 23. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
17 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
18 work, including but not limited to, time spent time spent receiving and/or responding to work-
19 related communications and undergoing pre-shift Covid-19 health screenings. This resulted in
20 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-
21 clock.

22 24. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
23 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

24 25. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
25 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

27 26. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to

document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

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

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

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

31. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and

1 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
2 records.

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

7 33. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid
9 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
10 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
11 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various
12 performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

13 34. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay
14 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked overtime, double
15 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
16 discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
17 compensation as part of the employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
18 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
19 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
20 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted
22 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
23 premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 Members by DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that
25 paid sick time for non-exempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular
26 rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or
27 not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as
28 articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of

1 pay” for purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the
2 underpayment of which is recoverable under Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or 204.

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

14 **F. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

26 37. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
28 phones and personal vehicles as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically,

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to use their own cell
2 phones and personal vehicles in order to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANT
3 unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the
4 personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phones and personal vehicles. As a
5 result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but
7 were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones and personal vehicles, all
8 on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

9 **G. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

10 38. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in
11 place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFFS and other
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including
13 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and
14 practice that resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
15 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did
16 in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping
17 system for PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying
18 these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for
19 overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from
20 time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being
21 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

22 39. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
23 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members'
24 time being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful
25 rounding policy and practice caused PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
26 perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without
27 receiving an off-duty meal break.

28 ///

1 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

2 40. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
3 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of
4 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
6 and rest breaks.

7 41. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally
8 alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and other
9 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all hours
10 worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed
11 rest break.

12 42. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
13 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
14 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

15 43. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
16 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
17 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees
19 were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of
20 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
21 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

22 44. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
23 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit
24 for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' 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 DEFENDANTS' business
27 records.

28 ///

1 **I. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

2 45. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
4 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
5 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
6 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

7 46. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, “If an employer discharges an employee, the
8 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.” Pursuant to
9 Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, “his or her wages shall become
10 due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours
11 previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her
12 wages at the time of quitting.” PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from
13 time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or
14 at the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202.

15 47. As such, PLAINTIFF demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not timely
16 paying all wages due at time of termination for all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members whose
17 employment ended during the CLASS PERIOD.

18 **J. Sick Pay Violations**

19 48. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that “An employee who, on or after
20 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from
21 the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”
22 Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements.
23 From time to time, DEFENDANT failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided
24 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick
25 leave.

26 49. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its
27 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.
28 From time to time, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish

1 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting
2 forth the amount of paid sick leave available

3 **K. Unlawful Deductions**

4 50. 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 51. 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. Further, DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for
20 required business expenses related to the use of his personal cell phone and personal vehicle, in
21 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802. To date, DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the
22 minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to him or any penalty wages owed
23 to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does
24 not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

25 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

26 52. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of himself, and a California class
27 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT and classified as
28 non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning

four (4) years prior to the filing of the original Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

54. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impractical.

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

- a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and practices;
- b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and practices;
- c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate overtime wages;

- e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- h. 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;
- i. 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;
- j. 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.

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

57. 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.

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

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

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

61. 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

1 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
2 sustained.

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

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

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

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

24
25
26
27
28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

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

21 68. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
22 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
23 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
24 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
25 1198, and 2802 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant
26 to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held
27 to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

28 69. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were unlawful and unfair
in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive unscrupulous
or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or utility for which

1 this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203 of the California
2 Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

3 70. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were deceptive and
4 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
5 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and
6 rest periods, and failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, due to a systematic business
7 practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare
8 Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this
9 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203,
10 including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

11 71. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
12 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
13 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
14 DEFENDANT.

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

19 73. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself and on behalf of each
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which an off-duty meal
21 period was not timely provided for each five (5) hours of work, and/or one (1) hour of pay for
22 each workday in which a second off-duty meal period was not timely provided for each ten (10)
23 hours of work.

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

27 75. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
28 DEFENDANT has obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the

1 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages for all time worked, and
2 has deprived them of valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the
3 detriment of these employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANT so as to allow DEFENDANT
4 to unfairly compete against competitors who comply with the law.

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

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

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

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

26
27 ///

- 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

3

4

5
6
7

8
9
10
11

12
1314
15
1617
18

19
20
21
22
23

24
25
26
27

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

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

10 89. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
12 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

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

25 92. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
26 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked
27 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act
28 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the
2 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal
3 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
4 these employees.

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

16 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

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

23 95. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
24 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
25 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all
26 overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or
27 twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.
28

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

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

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

10 99. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
11 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time
12 they worked, including overtime work.

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

20 101. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
21 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
22 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal
23 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
24 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
25 regulations.

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

1 103. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
2 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to
3 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
4 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining
5 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather,
6 PLAINTIFF bring this Action on behalf of himself, and the CALIFORNIA CLASS, based on
7 DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
8 California.

9 104. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked that they were entitled to, constituting
11 a failure to pay all earned wages.

12 105. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
14 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, & 1198, even
15 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were regularly required
16 to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which DEFENDANT
17 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
18 witnessed by employees.

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

24 107. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
25 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were undercompensated for their time worked.
26 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
27 nonfeasance, to not pay them for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice and
28 procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay PLAINTIFF

1 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct overtime wages for their
2 overtime worked.

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

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

21 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

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

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

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

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

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

20 113. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
21 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial,
22 and seek all wages earned and due, interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.
23
24
25
26
27
28

///

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

8 115. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
9 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
10 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
11 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)
12 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and
13 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour
15 wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by
17 DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. In addition, DEFENDANT failed to compensate
18 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as required by the
19 applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide
20 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid rest
21 periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Pay Wages When Due

(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)

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

118. 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.

119. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

As used in this article:

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

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

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

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.

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

123. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

1 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with
2 Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
3 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.

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

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

12 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

14 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

16
17 126. 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.

20 127. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
21 “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

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

128. 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. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the correct name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8).

129. 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.

130. 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 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Failure To Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

13 131. 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.

16 132. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:

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

20 133. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab.
21 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
23 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of their personal cell
25 phones and personal vehicles all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically,
26 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use
27 their personal cell phones and personal vehicles to execute their essential job duties on behalf of
28 DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse

1 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses resulting from the use of
2 their personal cell phones and personal vehicles for DEFENDANT within the course and scope
3 of their employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their
4 principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver
5 of this expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF
6 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse
7 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is
8 required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

9 134. PLAINTIFF therefore demand reimbursement for expenditures or losses incurred
10 by him and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members in the discharge of their job duties for
11 DEFENDANT, or their obedience to the directions of DEFENDANT, with interest at the
12 statutory rate and costs under Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

13 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

15 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

16 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF against all Defendants)**

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

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

1 137. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the
2 requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act,
3 bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to himself and
4 all individuals classified as all non-exempt employees who worked for DEFENDANTS in
5 California during the time period of September 11, 2022, until the present (the "AGGRIEVED
6 EMPLOYEES").

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

15 139. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
16 business act or practice because DEFENDANTS (a) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
17 minimum wages and overtime wages, (b) failed to provide AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES legally
18 required meal and rest breaks, (c) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct regular
19 rate of pay, (d) failed to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, and (e) failed to
20 timely pay wages, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code
21 §2699.5, including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6,
22 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
23 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, and the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), and
24 thereby gives rise to statutory penalties as a result of such conduct. PLAINTIFF hereby seeks
25 recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004
26 as the representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF
27 and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.
28

1 140. For all provisions of the Labor Code for which civil penalty is not specifically
2 provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100)
3 for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred
4 dollars (\$200) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation.
5 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to an award of reasonable
6 attorney's fees and costs in connection with their claims for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code
7 Section 2699(g)(1).

8 141. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect
9 PLAINTIFF during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF seeks penalties for those violations that
10 affected other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. (*Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.* (2018) 30
11 Cal.App.5th 504, 519; See also *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App.
12 5th 745, 751 ["PAGA allows an "aggrieved employee"—a person affected by at least one Labor
13 Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations
14 committed by that employer."], Emphasis added, reh'g denied (June 13, 2018).).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

4 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

15 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;

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

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

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

4. 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: November 8, 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: November 8, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: 

Shani O. Zakay

Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Client # 65701

September 11, 2023

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendant
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION

c/o Tyler Termeer
1035 Market Street, Ste. 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0842 0055 29

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, 1199, 2802, and 2804, 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 ANDREW ELLENBERG-WILEY (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant from September of 2021 to October of 2022, 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. Defendant, 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, Defendant failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for earned wages.

As a consequence of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff further contends that Defendant 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, 1199, 2802, and 2804, 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 in California during the relevant claim period.

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, 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 Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

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, Defendant is 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 Defendant 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 blue ink, appearing to read 'Shani O. Zakay', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Sydney Castillo Johnson (State Bar #343881)
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
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
Julieann Alvarado (State Bar #334727)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 5400
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com
julieann@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ANDREW ELLENBERG-WILEY, an
individual, on behalf of himself, and on behalf
of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION, a
California nonprofit corporation; and DOES 1-
50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 *et seq*;
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
- 3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, *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;
- 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) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF ANDREW ELLENBERG-WILEY (“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 SAN FRANCISCO AIDS FOUNDATION (“DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANTS”) is a California nonprofit corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. DEFENDANT operates sexual health clinics throughout the state of California, including in the county of San Francisco, where PLAINTIFF worked.

3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from September 2021 to October of 2022 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class, defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined

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

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

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

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

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the
2 Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

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

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

14 10. DEFENDANT's uniform policies and practices alleged herein were unlawful,
15 unfair, and deceptive business practices whereby DEFENDANT retained and continue to retain
16 wages due to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

17 11. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
18 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by
20 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
21 relief.

22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

27 13. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
28 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs

1 the CALIFORNIA CLASS across California, including in this County, and committed the
2 wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

3 **THE CONDUCT**

4 14. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
5 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
6 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically
7 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate
8 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest
9 periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
10 time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
13 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue
15 to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage
16 statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
17 periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT’s
18 uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment
19 for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit
20 and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable
21 tolling operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS against DEFENDANT, the CLASS
22 PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

23 **A. Meal Period Violations**

24 15. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
25 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
26 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
27 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
28 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work

1 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically,
2 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be
3 PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not
4 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
5 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
6 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
7 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
8 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
9 records.

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

27 **B. Rest Period Violations**

28

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

15 **C. Wage Statement Violations**

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

24 19. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for
26 missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also
27 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and
28 accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours

1 worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding
2 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
3 meal and rest periods.

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

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

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

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

15 23. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
16 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
17 work, including but not limited to, time spent time spent receiving and/or responding to work-
18 related communications and undergoing pre-shift Covid-19 health screenings. This resulted in
19 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-
20 clock.

21 24. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
22 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

23 25. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
24 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

26 26. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
27 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
28

document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

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

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

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

31. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and

1 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
2 records.

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

7 33. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid
9 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
10 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
11 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various
12 performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

13 34. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay
14 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked overtime, double
15 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
16 discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
17 compensation as part of the employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
18 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
19 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
20 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted
22 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
23 premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 Members by DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that
25 paid sick time for non-exempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular
26 rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or
27 not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as
28 articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of

1 pay” for purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the
2 underpayment of which is recoverable under Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or 204.

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

14 **F. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

26 37. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
28 phones and personal vehicles as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically,

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to use their own cell
2 phones and personal vehicles in order to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANT
3 unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the
4 personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phones and personal vehicles. As a
5 result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but
7 were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones and personal vehicles, all
8 on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

9 **G. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

10 38. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS did not have in
11 place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFFS and other
12 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including
13 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and
14 practice that resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
15 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did
16 in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping
17 system for PLAINTIFFS and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying
18 these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for
19 overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from
20 time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being
21 accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

22 39. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system and unlawful
23 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members'
24 time being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANTS' unlawful
25 rounding policy and practice caused PLAINTIFFS and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
26 perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without
27 receiving an off-duty meal break.

28 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

1 40. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
2 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of
3 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
5 and rest breaks.

6 41. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally
7 alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and other
8 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all hours
9 worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed
10 rest break.

11 42. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
12 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
13 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

14 43. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
15 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
16 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees
18 were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of
19 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
20 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

21 44. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit
23 for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and
24 practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all
25 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business
26 records.

27 **I. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**
28

1 45. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
3 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
4 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
5 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

6 46. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, “If an employer discharges an employee, the
7 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.” Pursuant to
8 Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, “his or her wages shall become
9 due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours
10 previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her
11 wages at the time of quitting.” PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from
12 time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or
13 at the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202.

14 47. As such, PLAINTIFF demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not timely
15 paying all wages due at time of termination for all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members whose
16 employment ended during the CLASS PERIOD.

17 **J. Sick Pay Violations**

18 48. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that “An employee who, on or after
19 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from
20 the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”
21 Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements.
22 From time to time, DEFENDANT failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided
23 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick
24 leave.

25 49. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its
26 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.
27 From time to time, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish
28 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements setting

1 forth the amount of paid sick leave available

2 **K. Unlawful Deductions**

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

7 51. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
8 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for his rest and meal periods.
9 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)
10 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
11 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which he was required
12 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF
13 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
14 DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
15 supposed to be his off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
16 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT'S strict corporate policy
17 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to
18 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for
19 required business expenses related to the use of his personal cell phone and personal vehicle, in
20 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802. 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 52. 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 and classified as
27 non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning
28

1 four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the
2 Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

3 53. 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 compensate for off-the-clock work, failure to provide
7 accurate itemized wage statements, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failure to maintain
8 required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and expenses.

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

11 55. 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, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements accurate,
16 failed to reimburse for business expenses, 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

- 1 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 3 f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- 5 g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 6 h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
7 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
8 CLASS for all time worked;
- 9 i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
10 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit
12 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
13 permit this work;
- 14 j. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition in violation of the
15 UCL, by failing to provide the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS with the legally required meal and rest periods.

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

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

21 58. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

23 59. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
24 litigation.

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

27 61. There is a strong community of interest among PLAINTIFF and the members of
28 the CALIFORNIA CLASS to, inter alia, ensure that the combined assets of DEFENDANT are

1 sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries
2 sustained.

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

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

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

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

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

10 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may
11 be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such orders or
12 judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the
13 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).

14 68. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
15 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
16 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
17 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1,
18 1198, and 2802 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant
19 to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held
20 to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

26 70. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT’s practices were deceptive and
27 fraudulent in that DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice failed to provide the legally
28 mandated meal and rest periods and the required amount of compensation for missed meal and

1 rest periods, and failed to pay minimum and overtime wages owed, due to a systematic business
2 practice that cannot be justified, pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare
3 Commission requirements in violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this
4 Court should issue injunctive and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203,
5 including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Pay Minimum Wages

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

Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against ALL Defendants)

80. 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.

1 81. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
2 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
3 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay
4 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 89. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
6 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

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

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

27 93. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore request
28 recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the

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

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 98. Cal. Lab. Code § 1194 establishes an employee's right to recover unpaid wages,
28 including minimum and overtime compensation and interest thereon, together with the costs of

1 suit. Cal. Lab. Code § 1198 further states that the employment of an employee for longer hours
2 than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

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

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

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

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

22 103. Cal. Lab. Code § 515 sets out various categories of employees who are exempt
23 from the overtime requirements of the law. None of these exemptions are applicable to
24 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Further, PLAINTIFF and the
25 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are not subject to a valid collective bargaining
26 agreement that would preclude the causes of action contained herein this Complaint. Rather,
27 PLAINTIFF bring this Action on behalf of himself, and the CALIFORNIA CLASS, based on
28

1 DEFENDANT's violations of non-negotiable, non-waivable rights provided by the State of
2 California.

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

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

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

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

25 108. In performing the acts and practices herein alleged in violation of California labor
26 laws, and refusing to compensate the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked
27 and provide them with the requisite compensation, DEFENDANT acted and continues to act
28 intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously toward PLAINTIFF and the other members of the

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS with a conscious of and utter disregard for their legal rights, or the
2 consequences to them, and with the despicable intent of depriving them of their property and legal
3 rights, and otherwise causing them injury in order to increase company profits at the expense of
4 these employees.

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

15 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

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

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

19 110. 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.

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

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

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

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

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

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

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

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

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

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour
2 wages *in lieu* thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by
4 DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. In addition, DEFENDANT failed to compensate
5 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as required by the
6 applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide
7 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid rest
8 periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

17 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

19 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

24 119. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

25 As used in this article:

- 26 (d) "Wages" includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every
27 description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time,
28 task, piece, Commission basis, or other method of calculation.

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

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

7 121. Cal. Lab. Code § 202 provides, in relevant part, that:

8 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
9 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
10 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
11 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
12 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
13 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and
14 designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment
15 for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of
16 quitting.

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

19 123. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

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

28 125. 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.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements

(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)

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

2
3 126. PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, reallege and
4 incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this
5 Complaint.

6 127. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
7 “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- 8 a. Gross wages earned,
- 9 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
10 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
11 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
12 Industrial Welfare Commission,
- 13 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
14 is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- 15 d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
16 may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- 17 e. net wages earned,
- 18 f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- 19 g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
20 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an
21 employee identification number other than social security number may be shown
22 on the itemized statement,
- 23 h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- 24 i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
25 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

26 128. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF’S and other
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed
28 meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT violated Cal.

1 Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other
3 things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked
4 and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of
5 time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and
6 rest periods. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that provided the correct name and
8 address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(8).

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

12 130. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
13 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
14 CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct
15 wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not
16 properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
17 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover
18 liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation
19 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
20 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
21 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
22 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

23 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **Failure To Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses**

25 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

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

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

8 133. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab.
9 Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
10 members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's
11 benefit. DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
12 members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, the use of their personal cell
13 phones and personal vehicles all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT. Specifically,
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANT to use
15 their personal cell phones and personal vehicles to execute their essential job duties on behalf of
16 DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT's uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse
17 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for expenses resulting from the use of
18 their personal cell phones and personal vehicles for DEFENDANT within the course and scope
19 of their employment for DEFENDANT. These expenses were necessary to complete their
20 principal job duties. DEFENDANT is estopped by DEFENDANT's conduct to assert any waiver
21 of this expectation. Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF
22 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse
23 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is
24 required to do under the laws and regulations of California.

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

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

2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for

violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226

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

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

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