



ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203
shani@zakaylaw.com
jackland@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

[Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

CRISTAL RODRIGUEZ, on behalf of
herself and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

EAH INC., a California Corporation; and
DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

DEFENDANTS.

Case No: 21CV00884

**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;
- 6) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§226 and 226.2;
- 7) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
- 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203.
- 9) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR CODE §§ 2698 *et seq.*]

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)

3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204

San Diego, CA 92110

Telephone: (619)599-8292

Facsimile: (619) 599-8291

jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 Plaintiff Cristal Rodriquez, an individual, (“PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of herself and all other
2 similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for
3 their own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

4 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

5 1. Defendant EAH INC. (“DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANTS”) is Corporation
6 and at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and
7 regular business throughout California.

8 2. DEFENDANTS operate a housing and management business that provides
9 affordable rental housing to residents in California, including the Santa Cruz, California location
10 where PLAINTIFF worked.

11 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California as a non-exempt
12 employee entitled to minimum wages, overtime pay and meal and rest periods from April 15,
13 2019 to August of 2020.

14 4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
15 defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS in California
16 and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the
17 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of the original Complaint and ending on the date
18 as determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy
19 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
20 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

1 future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 who have been economically injured by DEFENDANTS' past and current unlawful conduct, and
3 all other appropriate legal and equitable relief.

4 6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
5 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
6 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sue these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious
7 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this First
8 Amended Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive,
9 when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believe, and based upon that information
10 and belief allege, that the DEFENDANTS named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through
11 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that
12 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

21 **THE CONDUCT**

22 8. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS
23 were required to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time
24 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer,
25 including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time,
26 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without
27 paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANTS' control. Specifically, PLAINTIFF
28 performed work before and after the beginning of her shift, spending time under DEFENDANTS'

1 control for which she was not compensated. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required
2 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to remain on-call for the entire duration
3 between her scheduled shifts in order to answer to work-related issues and emergencies. As a
4 result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited minimum wage and
5 overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and
6 without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. DEFENDANTS'
7 uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
8 for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

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

13 10. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
14 Members' compensation was DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
15 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
16 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
17 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
18 various performance goals set by DEFENDANTS. However, when calculating the regular rate
19 of pay in order to pay overtime to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members,
20 DEFENDANTS failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the employees' "regular
21 rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay. Specifically, DEFENDANTS paid
22 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members a lodging and/or housing stipend.
23 However, DEFENDANTS failed to correctly calculate the lodging and/or housing stipend into
24 the regular rate for purposes of calculating overtime pay. Management and supervisors described
25 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
26 However, DEFENDANTS failed to include incentive compensation into the "regular rate of pay"
27 for purposes of calculating overtime pay. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received
28 by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate

1 of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of overtime compensation
2 to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANTS.

3 11. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members were also from time to time unable to take off duty meal breaks and were not
5 fully relieved of duty for meal periods. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 Members were from time to time interrupted during their off-duty meal breaks to complete tasks
7 for DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
8 perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without
9 receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which
11 these employees were required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work.
12 DEFENDANTS’ policy caused PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
13 remain on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal periods.
14 PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks
15 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate policy
16 and practice.

17 12. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, from time to time, PLAINTIFF and
18 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours
19 without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their
20 first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)
21 hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between
22 six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for
23 some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. When they did have an opportunity to take their
24 rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often interrupted and
25 required by DEFENDANTS to work during their rest breaks. When they did have an opportunity
26 to take their rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
27 remain on the premises, on-duty and on-call, and subject to DEFENDANTS’ control in
28 accordance with DEFENDANTS’ policy. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. DEFENDANTS' policy
2 caused PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to remain on-call and on-duty
3 during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest periods. As a result of their rigorous work
4 schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their
5 proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

6 13. Under California law, every employer shall pay to each employee, on the
7 established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all
8 hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece,
9 commission, or otherwise. Hours worked is defined in the applicable Wage Order as "the time
10 during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the
11 employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." PLAINTIFF and
12 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time required to perform work for
13 DEFENDANTS before and after their scheduled shifts, as well as during their off-duty meal
14 breaks. DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 Members for any of the time spent under DEFENDANTS' control while working off-the-clock.
16 As such, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
17 the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a payroll period.

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

27 15. From time to time, when PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
28 worked during what was supposed to be their meal breaks or otherwise off the clock,

1 DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things,
3 the correct time worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday
4 and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the
5 pay period, and the correct penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods in violation of
6 California Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.2.

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

15 17. Aside from the violations listed herein, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to
16 PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor
17 Code 226 *et seq.* From time to time DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section
18 226(a)(2) by failing to provide an accurate amount of total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS included items,
20 including but not limited to "California Meal" to the total hours worked. However, the foregoing
21 item is not considered total hours worked for purposes of California Labor Code Section
22 226(a)(2). Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage statement
23 to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that included the total hours
24 worked at the applicable hourly rate. Finally, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an
25 itemized wage statement that included the name of the legal entity that is the employer of
26 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. As a result, from time to time
27 DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with
28 wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

12 19. In the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANTS to use their own personal
14 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
15 DEFENDANTS but were not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANTS for the cost
16 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANTS' benefit. Specifically,
17 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to
18 use their personal cell phones for work related issues, including but not limited to, work related
19 communications and using the phone application "Kronos" to clock in and out for work. As a
20 result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS the PLAINTIFFS and other
21 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which
22 included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on
23 behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS.

24 20. By reason of this uniform conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANTS committed acts of unfair competition in
26 violation of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the
27 "UCL"), by engaging in a company-wide policy and procedure which failed to accurately
28 calculate and record the correct overtime rate for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. The proper calculation of these employees' overtime hour
2 rates is the DEFENDANTS' burden. As a result of DEFENDANTS' intentional disregard of the
3 obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANTS failed to properly calculate and/or pay all required
4 overtime compensation for work performed by the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and
5 violated the California Labor Code and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

6 21. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
7 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods.
8 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
9 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
10 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required
11 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF
12 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on the premises, on-duty and on-call, for
13 the rest break. DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during
14 what was supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest
15 breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate
16 policy and practice. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF to remain
17 on-call for the entire duration between her scheduled shifts in order to answer to work-related
18 issues and emergencies. However, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF for all her
19 time spent under DEFENDANTS' control. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided
20 PLAINTIFF with a paystub that failed to accurately display PLAINTIFF's correct time worked
21 and wages, as well as payments for missed meal and rest periods for certain pay periods in
22 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a). To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF
23 the overtime compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab.
24 Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually do not exceed the sum or
25 value of \$75,000.

26 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

27 22. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
28 Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This

1 action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of
2 DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

3 23. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
4 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS (i) currently maintain and at all relevant times
5 maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conduct substantial business in this County,
6 and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

8 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

9 24. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
10 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as a Class
11 Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all
12 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS in California and classified
13 as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning
14 four (4) years prior to the filing of the original complaint and ending on the date as determined by
15 the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate
16 claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

20 26. DEFENDANTS, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
21 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
22 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
23 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANTS systematically failed to record all meal
24 and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS,
25 even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform
26 this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work.

27 27. DEFENDANTS have the legal burden to establish that each and every
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately and was provided all meal and rest breaks

missed as required by California laws. DEFENDANTS, however, as a matter of uniform and systematic policy and procedure failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid as required by law, so as to satisfy its burden. This common business practice applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this claim.

28. The CALIFORNIA CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is impracticable.

29. DEFENDANTS uniformly violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California law by:

- a. Violating the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures that failed to pay all wages due the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- b. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by failing to provide mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members;
- c. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*, by violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties; and
- d. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures that uniformly and systematically failed to record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA

1 CLASS for all time worked, including minimum wages owed and overtime wages
2 owed for work performed by these employees.

3 30. The Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
4 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 5 a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that the
6 joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a
7 class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 8 b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are
9 raised in this First Amended Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS
10 will apply uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 11 c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
12 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of
13 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were classified as a non- exempt employee paid on an
14 hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANTS' deceptive practice and
15 policy which failed to provide the legally required meal and rest periods to the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically underpaid compensation to
17 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury
18 as a result of DEFENDANTS' employment practices. PLAINTIFF, like all the
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were subjected to the uniform
20 employment practices of DEFENDANTS and was a non-exempt employee paid
21 on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive wages who was
22 subjected to the DEFENDANTS' practice and policy which failed to pay the
23 correct rate of overtime wages due to the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime
24 worked by the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically under pays
25 overtime compensation to the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or identically
27 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of
28 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANTS; and

1 d. The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
2 the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained counsel who are
3 competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no material
4 conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and the members
5 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate.
6 Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

26 i. With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to restitution
28 because through this claim PLAINTIFF seek declaratory relief holding that

1 the DEFENDANTS' policy and practices constitute unfair competition,
2 along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and incidental equitable
3 relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct declared to
4 constitute unfair competition;

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

11 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in individually
12 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in that the
13 substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the
14 relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the substantial
16 expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

17 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
18 that would create the risk of:

19 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish
21 incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANTS; and/or;

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

27 iii. In the context of wage litigation, because a substantial number of
28 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal

1 rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANTS, which may adversely
2 affect an individual's job with DEFENDANTS or with a subsequent
3 employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through
4 a representative; and

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

10 32. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
11 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

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

1 in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which
2 DEFENDANTS' actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

3 f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
4 DEFENDANTS are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;

6 g. DEFENDANTS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
7 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate
8 with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;

9 h. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from the
10 business records of DEFENDANTS; and

11 i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
12 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims
13 arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANTS as to the members of the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

15 33. DEFENDANTS maintain records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
16 by job title each of DEFENDANTS' employees who as have been systematically, intentionally
17 and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANTS' company policy, practices and procedures as herein
18 alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the First Amended Complaint to include any
19 additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

20 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

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

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

13 36. DEFENDANTS maintain records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
14 by name and job title, each of DEFENDANTS’ employees who have been systematically,
15 intentionally and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANT’S company policy, practices and
16 procedures as herein alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the First Amended Complaint
17 to include any additional job titles of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

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

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

- 22 a. Whether DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
23 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB- CLASS for
24 missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California Labor Code and
25 California regulations and the applicable California Wage Order;
- 26 b. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of
27 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with legally required uninterrupted
28 thirty (30) minute meal breaks and rest periods;

- 1 c. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of
- 2 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized wage
- 3 statements;
- 4 d. Whether DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to pay overtime compensation to
- 5 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in violation of the
- 6 California Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable California
- 7 Wage Order;
- 8 e. Whether the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are entitled to
- 9 compensation for time worked, including overtime worked, under the overtime
- 10 pay requirements of California law;
- 11 f. Whether DEFENDANTS have engaged in unfair competition by the above-listed
- 12 conduct;
- 13 g. The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
- 14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and
- 15 h. Whether DEFENDANTS' conduct was willful.
- 16 39. DEFENDANTS violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
- 17 under California law by:
- 18 a. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*, by failing to correctly pay PLAINTIFF
- 19 and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due for
- 20 overtime worked, for which DEFENDANTS are liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code
- 21 § 1194;
- 22 b. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to accurately
- 23 pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
- 24 the correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANTS are liable pursuant to
- 25 Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
- 26 c. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and
- 27 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with all legally required off-duty,
- 28 uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required rest breaks;

- d. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate itemized statement in writing showing all accurate rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each overtime rate by the employee;
- e. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties;
- f. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay the employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full payment and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by California law to the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated their employment.

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

- a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that the joinder of all CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are raised in this First Amended Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and will apply uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS;
- c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABORSUB-CLASS, was a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive wages who was subjected to the DEFENDANTS' practice and policy which failed

1 to pay the correct rate of overtime wages and total amount of wages due to the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as
3 a result of DEFENDANTS' employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members
4 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or identically
5 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of
6 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANTS; and

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

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

- 17 a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory
18 and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions
19 by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will create
20 the risk of:
- 21 i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
22 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would establish
23 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
24 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or
- 25 ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
26 LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of
27 interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially
28 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.

- 1 b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or
2 refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
3 SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT uniformly
5 failed to pay all wages due for all time worked by the members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;
- 7 c. Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations
9 of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any question affecting
10 only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and a Class
11 Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication
12 of the controversy, including consideration of:
- 13 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in
15 that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover
16 the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared to the
18 substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;
- 19 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
20 that would create the risk of:
- 21 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
22 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, which
23 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
24 DEFENDANTS; and/or,
- 25 2. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical matter
27 be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to
28

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

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

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

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

- a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
- b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- c. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;

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

24 ///

25 ///

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
UNLAWFUL BUSINESS PRACTICES
(Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against all DEFENDANTS)

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

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

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

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

46. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have engaged and continues to engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 206.5, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802 for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

1 47. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were unlawful and
2 unfair in that these practices violated public policy, were immoral, unethical, oppressive
3 unscrupulous or substantially injurious to employees, and were without valid justification or
4 utility for which this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203
5 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully
6 withheld.

7 48. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were deceptive and
8 fraudulent in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice failed to pay PLAINTIFF, and
9 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, wages due, failed to accurately to record the time
10 worked, and failed to reimburse for expenses due to a systematic practice that cannot be justified,
11 pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in
12 violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive
13 and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages
14 wrongfully withheld.

15 49. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unlawful,
16 unfair and deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
17 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
18 DEFENDANTS.

19 50. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and
20 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
21 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

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

1 52. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of herself and on behalf of each
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS member, one (1) hour of pay for each workday in which a rest period was
3 not timely provided as required by law.

4 53. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
5 DEFENDANTS have obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
6 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages, and has deprived them of
7 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the detriment of these
8 employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANTS so as to allow DEFENDANT to unfairly compete
9 against competitors who comply with the law.

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

15 55. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are entitled to,
16 and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to restore to them the money and property which
17 DEFENDANTS have acquired, or of which PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS have been deprived, by means of the above described unlawful and unfair
19 business practices, including earned but unpaid wages.

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

24 57. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have no plain,
25 speedy and/or adequate remedy at law that will end the unlawful and unfair business practices of
26 DEFENDANTS. Further, the practices herein alleged presently continue to occur unabated. As a
27 result of the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein, PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable legal

1 and economic harm unless DEFENDANTS are restrained from continuing to engage in these
2 unlawful and unfair business practices.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

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

6 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL**
7 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 64. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
28 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result

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

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

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

13 67. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
14 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked than
15 they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

16 68. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
17 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
18 for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
19 SUB-CLASS have suffered and will continue to suffer an economic injury in amounts which are
20 presently unknown to them and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

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

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

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

20 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION**

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

23 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL**
24 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

1 73. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
2 bring a claim for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code
3 and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately
4 calculate the applicable rates for all overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and DEFENDANTS' failure to properly compensate the
6 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked, including, work
7 performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

18 77. DEFENDANTS maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and
19 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct
20 amount of overtime worked and correct applicable overtime rate for the amount of overtime they
21 worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
22 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and the
23 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and DEFENDANTS in fact failed
24 to pay these employees the correct applicable overtime wages for all overtime worked.

25 78. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
26 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result
27 of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
28 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for all overtime worked,

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

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

9 80. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
10 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive
11 full compensation for all overtime worked.

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

20 82. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
21 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked than
22 they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

1 to accurately record and pay using the applicable overtime rate as evidenced by DEFENDANT'S
2 business records and witnessed by employees.

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

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

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

23 87. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
24 therefore request recovery of all unpaid wages, including overtime wages, according to proof,
25 interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against
26 DEFENDANTS, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable
27 statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA
28 LABOR SUB-CLASS Members who have terminated their employment, DEFENDANTS'

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

6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

9 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
10 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

14 89. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to provide all
15 the legally required off-duty meal breaks to PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA LABOR
16 SUB-CLASS Members as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. The nature of
17 the work performed by PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS MEMBERS did
18 not prevent these employees from being relieved of all of their duties for the legally required off-
19 duty meal periods. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other
20 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were often not fully relieved of duty by
21 DEFENDANTS for their meal periods. Additionally, DEFENDANTS' failure to provide
22 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with legally required meal
23 breaks prior to their fifth (5th) hour of work is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.
24 As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
25 therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with
26 DEFENDANTS' strict corporate policy and practice.

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

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

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

7 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS**

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

10 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
11 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

15 93. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
16 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
17 Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
18 shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)
19 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and
20 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.
21 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not provided
22 with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF
23 and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper
24 rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers. When DEFENDANTS provided
25 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with rest break, they
26 required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members to stay on
27 DEFENDANTS' premises for those rest breaks.

1 94. DEFENDANTS further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the
2 applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA LABOR
3 SUB-CLASS Members who were not provided a rest period, in accordance with the applicable
4 Wage Order, one additional hour of compensation at each employee’s regular rate of pay for each
5 workday that rest period was not provided.

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

9 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS**

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226 and 226.2)**

12 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
13 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

17 97. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
18 “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- 19 a. Gross wages earned;
- 20 b. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
21 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
22 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
23 Industrial Welfare Commission;
- 24 c. The number of piece rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
25 is paid on a piece-rate basis;
- 26 d. All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
27 employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- 28 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 or an employee identification number other than a 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.

98. Cal. Labor Code § 226.2 provides that an employer must furnish piece-rate employees with an “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- a. The total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the rate of compensation, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the pay period; and
- b. The total hours of other nonproductive time, the rate of compensation, and the gross wages paid for that time during the pay period.

99. When DEFENDANTS did not accurately record PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ wages, including overtime wages, owed, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct overtime rate, the correct number of hours worked, missed meal and rest periods, owed to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Aside from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* From time to time DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2) by failing

1 to provide an accurate amount of total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS included items, including but not limited
3 to “California Meal” to the total hours worked. However, the foregoing item is not considered
4 total hours worked for purposes of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2). Further,
5 DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage statement to PLAINTIFF and
6 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that included the total hours worked at the
7 applicable hourly rate. Finally, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage
8 statement that included the name of the legal entity that is the employer of PLAINTIFF and other
9 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. As a result, from time to time DEFENDANTS provided
10 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which
11 violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRES EXPENSES

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)

**(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all
DEFENDANTS)**

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

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

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

103. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code § 2802, by failing to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for required expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties for DEFENDANT's benefit. DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to using their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS. . Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to use their personal cell phones for work related issues, including but not limited to, work related communications and using the phone application "Kronos" to clock in and out for work. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy, practice and procedure was to not reimburse PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS members for expenses resulting from using their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANTS within the course and scope of their employment for DEFENDANTS. These expenses were necessary to complete their principal job duties.

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

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

10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES WHEN DUE**

12 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§201, 202, 203)**

13 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
14 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

18 106. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

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

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

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

2
3 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
4 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
5 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her
6 intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the
7 time of quitting. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who
8 quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by
9 mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. The date of the
10 mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to
11 provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

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

14 110. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

15
16 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance
17 with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is
18 discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty
19 from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is
20 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

21 111. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
22 Members terminated and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of wages, to these
23 employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

24 112. Therefore, as provided by Cal Lab. Code § 203, on behalf of herself and the
25 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS whose employment has, PLAINTIFF
26 demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not paying all wages due at time of termination
27 for all employees who terminated employment during the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
28

1 PERIOD, and demands an accounting and payment of all wages due, plus interest and statutory
2 costs as allowed by law.

3 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

5 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

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

7 113. PLAINTIFF reallege and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
8 herein, the prior paragraphs of this First Amended Complaint.

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

18 115. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
19 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
20 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to
21 themselves and all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT MGSACT
22 and/or DEFENDANT A&A and classified as non-exempt employees in California during the time
23 period of April 5, 2020 until the present (the "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES").

24 116. On April 5, 2021, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by certified mail to the Labor
25 and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the specific
26 provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See
27 Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting
28 period for Plaintiff to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant

1 to Section 2699.3, Plaintiff may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA
2 pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED
3 EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

4 117. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
5 business act or practice because DEFENDANTS (a) failed to properly record and pay
6 PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all of the hours they worked,
7 including overtime hours in violation of the Wage Order, (b) failed to provide accurate itemized
8 wage statements, (c) failed to provide mandatory meal breaks and rest breaks, and (d) failed to
9 timely pay wages, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code
10 §2699.5, including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6,
11 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198,
12 1199, 2802, and 2804 and the applicable Industrial Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to
13 statutory penalties as a result of such conduct. PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of civil
14 penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the
15 representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and
16 the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF pray for a judgment against each DEFENDANTS, jointly
19 and severally, as follows:

20 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

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

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

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

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

- 24 a. Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys
25 General Act of 2004

26 4. On all claims:

- 27 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 28 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and

1 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
2 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, §1194, §1197
3 and/or §2802.
4

5 DATED: June 9, 2021
6

7 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

8 By: 
9 Shani O. Zakay
10 Attorney for Plaintiff

11 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

12
13 PLAINTIFF demands a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

14 DATED: June 9, 2021
15

16 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

17 By: 
18 Shani O. Zakay
19 Attorney for Plaintiff
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

EXHIBIT 1



Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Tel: 619-599-8292
Fax: 619-599-8291
Toll Free: 1-888-498-6999
www.jcl-lawfirm.com

April 5, 2021

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
PAGA@dir.ca.gov
Via Online Submission

EAH INC.
c/o LAURA HALL
22 PELICAN WAY
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901
Via Certified Mail with Return Receipt
No. 7019 1640 0000 6893 9058

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, and 2804 Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.3.

Dear Sir/ Madam:

This office represents CRISTAL RODRIGUEZ (“Plaintiff”) and other aggrieved employees in a proposed class and representative action against EAH INC. (“Defendant”). This office intends to file the enclosed Class Action Complaint on behalf of Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees. The purpose of this correspondence is to provide the Labor and Workforce Development Agency with notice of alleged violations of the California Labor Code and certain facts and theories in support of the alleged violations in accordance with Labor Code section 2699.3.

Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from April 15, 2019 to August of 2020. Plaintiff was paid on an hourly basis and entitled to legally required meal and rest periods. At all times during her employment, Defendant failed to, among other things, provide Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, with all legally mandated off-duty meal and rest periods.

As a consequence, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to fully compensate her, and other similarly situated and aggrieved employees, for all earned wages and failed to provide California-compliant meal and rest breaks and accurate wage statements. Accordingly, Plaintiff contends that Defendant’s conduct violated Labor Code sections §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1199, 2802, and 2804 and applicable wage orders, and is therefore actionable pursuant to section 2698 *et seq.*

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint for the class action is attached hereto. The Complaint (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iv) sets forth

the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to the Plaintiff, and (v) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant. 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. The class action lawsuit consists of a class of other aggrieved employees. As class counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the class wide claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Act of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees and Class Members

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,
JCL LAW FIRM, APC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JC Lapuyade', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.

Enclosure (1)

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
Facsimile: (619) 599-8291

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204
San Diego, CA 92110
Telephone: (619)255-9047
Facsimile: (858) 404-9203

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ**

CRISTAL RODRIGUEZ, on behalf of
herself and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

EAH INC., a California 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 ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§226 and 226.2;
- 7) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
- 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Cristal Rodriquez, an individual, (“PLAINTIFF”), on behalf of herself and all
2 other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except
3 for their own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

4 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

5 1. Defendant EAH INC. (“DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANTS”) is Corporation
6 and at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and
7 regular business throughout California.

8 2. DEFENDANTS operate a housing and management business that provides
9 affordable rental housing to residents in California, including the Santa Cruz, California location
10 where PLAINTIFF worked.

11 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS in California as a non-exempt
12 employee entitled to minimum wages, overtime pay and meal and rest periods from April 15,
13 2019 to August of 2020.

14 4. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
15 defined as all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS in California
16 and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the
17 period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint and ending on the date as
18 determined by the Court (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD”). The amount in controversy
19 for the aggregate claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
20 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

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

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

20 **THE CONDUCT**

21 8. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS
22 were required to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time
23 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer,
24 including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time,
25 DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without
26 paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANTS' control. Specifically, PLAINTIFF
27 performed work before and after the beginning of her shift, spending time under DEFENDANTS'
28 control for which she was not compensated. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to remain on-call for the entire duration
2 between her scheduled shifts in order to answer to work-related issues and emergencies. As a
3 result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited minimum wage and
4 overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and
5 without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. DEFENDANTS'
6 uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
7 for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

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

12 10. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members' compensation was DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid
14 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
15 performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
16 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
17 various performance goals set by DEFENDANTS. However, when calculating the regular rate
18 of pay in order to pay overtime to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members,
19 DEFENDANTS failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the employees' "regular
20 rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay. Specifically, DEFENDANTS paid
21 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members a lodging and/or housing stipend.
22 However, DEFENDANTS failed to correctly calculate the lodging and/or housing stipend into
23 the regular rate for purposes of calculating overtime pay. Management and supervisors described
24 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
25 However, DEFENDANTS failed to include incentive compensation into the "regular rate of pay"
26 for purposes of calculating overtime pay. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received
27 by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate
28

1 of pay.” The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of overtime compensation
2 to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members by DEFENDANTS.

3 11. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS Members were also from time to time unable to take off duty meal breaks and were not
5 fully relieved of duty for meal periods. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 Members were from time to time interrupted during their off-duty meal breaks to complete tasks
7 for DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
8 perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without
9 receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
10 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which
11 these employees were required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work.
12 DEFENDANTS’ policy caused PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to
13 remain on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal periods.
14 PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members therefore forfeited meal breaks
15 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS’ strict corporate policy
16 and practice.

17 12. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, from time to time, PLAINTIFF and
18 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours
19 without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their
20 first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4)
21 hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between
22 six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for
23 some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. When they did have an opportunity to take their
24 rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were often interrupted and
25 required by DEFENDANTS to work during their rest breaks. When they did have an opportunity
26 to take their rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to
27 remain on the premises, on-duty and on-call, and subject to DEFENDANTS’ control in
28 accordance with DEFENDANTS’ policy. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS

1 Members were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. DEFENDANTS' policy
2 caused PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to remain on-call and on-duty
3 during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest periods. As a result of their rigorous work
4 schedules, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their
5 proper rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers.

6 13. Under California law, every employer shall pay to each employee, on the
7 established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all
8 hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece,
9 commission, or otherwise. Hours worked is defined in the applicable Wage Order as "the time
10 during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the
11 employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." PLAINTIFF and
12 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time required to perform work for
13 DEFENDANTS before and after their scheduled shifts, as well as during their off-duty meal
14 breaks. DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 Members for any of the time spent under DEFENDANTS' control while working off-the-clock.
16 As such, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
17 the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a payroll period.

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

27 15. From time to time, when PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
28 worked during what was supposed to be their meal breaks or otherwise off the clock,

1 DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
2 CLASS with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things,
3 the correct time worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday
4 and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the
5 pay period, and the correct penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods in violation of
6 California Labor Code Sections 226 and 226.2.

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

15 17. Aside from the violations listed herein, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to
16 PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor
17 Code 226 *et seq.* From time to time DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section
18 226(a)(2) by failing to provide an accurate amount of total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS included items,
20 including but not limited to "California Meal" to the total hours worked. However, the foregoing
21 item is not considered total hours worked for purposes of California Labor Code Section
22 226(a)(2). Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage statement
23 to PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that included the total hours
24 worked at the applicable hourly rate. Finally, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an
25 itemized wage statement that included the name of the legal entity that is the employer of
26 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. As a result, from time to time
27 DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with
28 wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

12 19. In the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANTS to use their own personal
14 cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
15 DEFENDANTS but were not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANTS for the cost
16 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANTS' benefit. Specifically,
17 PLAINTIFFS and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required by DEFENDANTS to
18 use their personal cell phones for work related issues, including but not limited to, work related
19 communications and using the phone application "Kronos" to clock in and out for work. As a
20 result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS the PLAINTIFFS and other
21 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS incurred unreimbursed business expenses which
22 included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on
23 behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS.

24 20. By reason of this uniform conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all
25 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, DEFENDANTS committed acts of unfair competition in
26 violation of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the
27 "UCL"), by engaging in a company-wide policy and procedure which failed to accurately
28 calculate and record the correct overtime rate for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other

1 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. The proper calculation of these employees' overtime hour
2 rates is the DEFENDANTS' burden. As a result of DEFENDANTS' intentional disregard of the
3 obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANTS failed to properly calculate and/or pay all required
4 overtime compensation for work performed by the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and
5 violated the California Labor Code and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

6 21. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
7 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods.
8 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5)
9 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to
10 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required
11 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF
12 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on the premises, on-duty and on-call, for
13 the rest break. DEFENDANTS' policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during
14 what was supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest
15 breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANTS' strict corporate
16 policy and practice. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF to remain
17 on-call for the entire duration between her scheduled shifts in order to answer to work-related
18 issues and emergencies. However, DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF for all her
19 time spent under DEFENDANTS' control. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided
20 PLAINTIFF with a paystub that failed to accurately display PLAINTIFF's correct time worked
21 and wages, as well as payments for missed meal and rest periods for certain pay periods in
22 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a). To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF
23 the overtime compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab.
24 Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually do not exceed the sum or
25 value of \$75,000.

26 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

27 22. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
28 Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This

1 action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of PLAINTIFF and similarly situated employees of
2 DEFENDANT pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382.

3 23. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
4 Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS (i) currently maintain and at all relevant times
5 maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conduct substantial business in this County,
6 and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against members of the
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS and CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS

8 **THE CALIFORNIA CLASS**

9 24. PLAINTIFF brings the First Cause of Action for Unfair, Unlawful and Deceptive
10 Business Practices pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL") as a Class
11 Action, pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, on behalf of a California class, defined as all
12 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANTS in California and classified
13 as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning
14 four (4) years prior to the filing of the original complaint and ending on the date as determined by
15 the Court (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate
16 claim of CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

20 26. DEFENDANTS, as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, and in
21 violation of the applicable Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order
22 requirements, and the applicable provisions of California law, intentionally, knowingly, and
23 willfully, engaged in a practice whereby DEFENDANTS systematically failed to record all meal
24 and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS,
25 even though DEFENDANTS enjoyed the benefit of this work, required employees to perform
26 this work and permitted or suffered to permit this work.

27 27. DEFENDANTS have the legal burden to establish that each and every
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS Member was paid accurately and was provided all meal and rest breaks

missed as required by California laws. DEFENDANTS, however, as a matter of uniform and systematic policy and procedure failed to have in place during the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD and still fails to have in place a policy or practice to ensure that each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member is paid as required by law, so as to satisfy its burden. This common business practice applicable to each and every CALIFORNIA CLASS Member can be adjudicated on a class-wide basis as unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive under Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the “UCL”) as causation, damages, and reliance are not elements of this claim.

28. The CALIFORNIA CLASS is so numerous that joinder of all CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is impracticable.

29. DEFENDANTS uniformly violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA CLASS under California law by:

- a. Violating the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures that failed to pay all wages due the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- b. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by failing to provide mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members;
- c. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of the California Unfair Competition Laws, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*, by violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFFS and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their job duties; and
- d. Committing an act of unfair competition in violation of, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively having in place company policies, practices and procedures that uniformly and systematically failed to record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA

1 CLASS for all time worked, including minimum wages owed and overtime wages
2 owed for work performed by these employees.

3 30. The Class Action meets the statutory prerequisites for the maintenance of a Class
4 Action as set forth in Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382, in that:

- 5 a. The persons who comprise the CALIFORNIA CLASS are so numerous that the
6 joinder of all such persons is impracticable and the disposition of their claims as a
7 class will benefit the parties and the Court;
- 8 b. Nearly all factual, legal, statutory, declaratory and injunctive relief issues that are
9 raised in this Complaint are common to the CALIFORNIA CLASS will apply
10 uniformly to every member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS;
- 11 c. The claims of the representative PLAINTIFF are typical of the claims of each
12 member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF, like all the other members of
13 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were classified as a non- exempt employee paid on an
14 hourly basis who was subjected to the DEFENDANTS’ deceptive practice and
15 policy which failed to provide the legally required meal and rest periods to the
16 CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically underpaid compensation to
17 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury
18 as a result of DEFENDANTS’ employment practices. PLAINTIFF, like all the
19 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, were subjected to the uniform
20 employment practices of DEFENDANTS and was a non-exempt employee paid
21 on an hourly basis and paid additional non-discretionary incentive wages who was
22 subjected to the DEFENDANTS’ practice and policy which failed to pay the
23 correct rate of overtime wages due to the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all overtime
24 worked by the CALIFORNIA CLASS and thereby systematically under pays
25 overtime compensation to the CALIFORNIA CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the
26 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were and are similarly or identically
27 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of
28 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANTS; and

1 d. The representative PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect
2 the interest of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and has retained counsel who are
3 competent and experienced in Class Action litigation. There are no material
4 conflicts between the claims of the representative PLAINTIFF and the members
5 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that would make class certification inappropriate.
6 Counsel for the CALIFORNIA CLASS will vigorously assert the claims of all
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

26 i. With respect to the First Cause of Action, the final relief on behalf of the
27 CALIFORNIA CLASS sought does not relate exclusively to restitution
28 because through this claim PLAINTIFF seek declaratory relief holding that

1 the DEFENDANTS' policy and practices constitute unfair competition,
2 along with declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and incidental equitable
3 relief as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct declared to
4 constitute unfair competition;

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

11 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in individually
12 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in that the
13 substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover the
14 relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
15 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members when compared to the substantial
16 expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;

17 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
18 that would create the risk of:

19 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, which would establish
21 incompatible standards of conduct for the DEFENDANTS; and/or;

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

27 iii. In the context of wage litigation, because a substantial number of
28 individual CALIFORNIA CLASS Members will avoid asserting their legal

1 rights out of fear of retaliation by DEFENDANTS, which may adversely
2 affect an individual's job with DEFENDANTS or with a subsequent
3 employer, the Class Action is the only means to assert their claims through
4 a representative; and

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

10 32. The Court should permit this action to be maintained as a Class Action pursuant
11 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382 because:

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

1 in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries which
2 DEFENDANTS' actions have inflicted upon the CALIFORNIA CLASS;

3 f. There is a community of interest in ensuring that the combined assets of
4 DEFENDANTS are sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS for the injuries sustained;

6 g. DEFENDANTS have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
7 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, thereby making final class-wide relief appropriate
8 with respect to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole;

9 h. The members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are readily ascertainable from the
10 business records of DEFENDANTS; and

11 i. Class treatment provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring an
12 efficient and rapid conclusion to all litigation of all wage and hour related claims
13 arising out of the conduct of DEFENDANTS as to the members of the
14 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

15 33. DEFENDANTS maintain records from which the Court can ascertain and identify
16 by job title each of DEFENDANTS' employees who as have been systematically, intentionally
17 and uniformly subjected to DEFENDANTS' company policy, practices and procedures as herein
18 alleged. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend the Complaint to include any additional job titles
19 of similarly situated employees when they have been identified.

20 **THE CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS**

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

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

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

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

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

- 22 a. Whether DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to correctly calculate and pay
23 compensation due to members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB- CLASS for
24 missed meal and rest breaks in violation of the California Labor Code and
25 California regulations and the applicable California Wage Order;
- 26 b. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of
27 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with legally required uninterrupted
28 thirty (30) minute meal breaks and rest periods;

- 1 c. Whether DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of
2 the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with accurate itemized wage
3 statements;
- 4 d. Whether DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to pay overtime compensation to
5 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS in violation of the
6 California Labor Code and California regulations and the applicable California
7 Wage Order;
- 8 e. Whether the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are entitled to
9 compensation for time worked, including overtime worked, under the overtime
10 pay requirements of California law;
- 11 f. Whether DEFENDANTS have engaged in unfair competition by the above-listed
12 conduct;
- 13 g. The proper measure of damages and penalties owed to the members of the
14 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; and
- 15 h. Whether DEFENDANTS' conduct was willful.
- 16 39. DEFENDANTS violated the rights of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
17 under California law by:
- 18 a. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq.*, by failing to correctly pay PLAINTIFF
19 and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS all wages due for
20 overtime worked, for which DEFENDANTS are liable pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code
21 § 1194;
- 22 b. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1 *et seq.*, by failing to accurately
23 pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
24 the correct minimum wage pay for which DEFENDANTS are liable pursuant to
25 Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1197;
- 26 c. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and
27 the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with all legally required off-duty,
28 uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal breaks and the legally required rest breaks;

- 1 d. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 226, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and the
2 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS with an accurate itemized
3 statement in writing showing all accurate rates in effect during the pay period and
4 the corresponding amount of time worked at each overtime rate by the employee;
5 e. Violating Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse PLAINTIFF and the
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS members with necessary expenses incurred in the
7 discharge of their job duties;
8 f. Violating Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and/or 203, which provides that when an
9 employee is discharged or quits from employment, the employer must pay the
10 employee all wages due without abatement, by failing to tender full payment
11 and/or restitution of wages owed or in the manner required by California law to
12 the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS who have terminated
13 their employment.

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

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

1 to pay the correct rate of overtime wages and total amount of wages due to the
2 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. PLAINTIFF sustained economic injury as
3 a result of DEFENDANTS' employment practices. PLAINTIFF and the members
4 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were and are similarly or identically
5 harmed by the same unlawful, deceptive, unfair and pervasive pattern of
6 misconduct engaged in by DEFENDANTS; and

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

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

- 17 a. Without class certification and determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory
18 and other legal questions within the class format, prosecution of separate actions
19 by individual members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS will create
20 the risk of:
- 21 i. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members
22 of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS which would establish
23 incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the
24 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS; or
- 25 ii. Adjudication with respect to individual members of the CALIFORNIA
26 LABOR SUB-CLASS which would as a practical matter be dispositive of
27 interests of the other members not party to the adjudication or substantially
28 impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.

- 1 b. The parties opposing the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS have acted or
2 refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR
3 SUB-CLASS, making appropriate class-wide relief with respect to the
4 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole in that DEFENDANT uniformly
5 failed to pay all wages due for all time worked by the members of the
6 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as required by law;
- 7 c. Common questions of law and fact predominate as to the members of the
8 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, with respect to the practices and violations
9 of California Law as listed above, and predominate over any question affecting
10 only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members, and a Class
11 Action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication
12 of the controversy, including consideration of:
- 13 i. The interests of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
14 in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions in
15 that the substantial expense of individual actions will be avoided to recover
16 the relatively small amount of economic losses sustained by the individual
17 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members when compared to the
18 substantial expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation;
- 19 ii. Class certification will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation
20 that would create the risk of:
- 21 1. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
22 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, which
23 would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the
24 DEFENDANTS; and/or,
- 25 2. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS would as a practical matter
27 be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to
28

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

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

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

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

- a. The questions of law and fact common to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members;
- b. A Class Action is superior to any other available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS because in the context of employment litigation a substantial number of individual CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members will avoid asserting their rights individually out of fear of retaliation or adverse impact on their employment;
- c. The members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS before the Court;

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

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

10 45. 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 46. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have 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, 206.5, 226, 226.7, 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 47. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS’ 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 this Court should issue equitable and injunctive relief pursuant to Section 17203

1 of the California Business & Professions Code, including restitution of wages wrongfully
2 withheld.

3 48. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were deceptive and
4 fraudulent in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice failed to pay PLAINTIFF, and
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, wages due, failed to accurately to record the time
6 worked, and failed to reimburse for expenses due to a systematic practice that cannot be justified,
7 pursuant to the applicable Cal. Lab. Code, and Industrial Welfare Commission requirements in
8 violation of Cal. Bus. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for which this Court should issue injunctive
9 and equitable relief, pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, including restitution of wages
10 wrongfully withheld.

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

15 50. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANTS' practices were also unfair and
16 deceptive in that DEFENDANTS' uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide
17 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members.

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

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

26 53. By and through the unlawful and unfair business practices described herein,
27 DEFENDANTS have obtained valuable property, money and services from PLAINTIFF and the
28 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, including earned wages, and has deprived them of

1 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law and contract, all to the detriment of these
2 employees and to the benefit of DEFENDANTS so as to allow DEFENDANT to unfairly compete
3 against competitors who comply with the law.

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

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

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

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

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

**FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES
(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1)**

**(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL
DEFENDANTS)**

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

59. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS bring a claim for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately calculate and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13 68. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
14 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
15 for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
16 SUB-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 69. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
19 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were under compensated for their time
20 worked. DEFENDANTS 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 DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
23 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the correct
24 minimum wages for their time worked.

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

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

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

14 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION**
16 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198)**

17 **(Alleged By PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS against ALL**
18 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

22 73. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
23 bring a claim for DEFENDANTS' willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code
24 and the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately
25 calculate the applicable rates for all overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and DEFENDANTS' failure to properly compensate the
27 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for overtime worked, including, work
28 performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

9 77. DEFENDANTS maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and
10 the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS without regard to the correct
11 amount of overtime worked and correct applicable overtime rate for the amount of overtime they
12 worked. As set forth herein, DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
13 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due for the overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and the
14 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS, and DEFENDANTS in fact failed
15 to pay these employees the correct applicable overtime wages for all overtime worked.

16 78. DEFENDANTS' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
17 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS as a whole, as a result
18 of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
19 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS for all overtime worked,
20 including, the work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or forty (40) hours
21 in any workweek.

22 79. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANTS
23 inaccurately calculated the amount of overtime worked and the applicable overtime rates and
24 consequently underpaid the actual time worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
25 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. DEFENDANTS acted in an illegal attempt to avoid the
26 payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code, the
27 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and regulations.

28 80. As a direct result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful wage practices as alleged herein,
PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS did not receive
full compensation for all overtime worked.

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

9 82. During the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the
10 other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS were paid less for time worked than
11 they were entitled to, constituting a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

19 84. By virtue of DEFENDANTS' unlawful failure to accurately pay all earned
20 compensation to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS
21 for the true time they worked, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR
22 SUB-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 85. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
25 members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS are under compensated for their overtime
26 worked. DEFENDANTS systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
27 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
28 and procedure, and DEFENDANTS perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS the applicable
overtime rate.

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

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

20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS**

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

23 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
24 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

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

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

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

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

19 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS**

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

22 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
23 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

27 93. PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were
28 required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods.
Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some
shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10)

1 minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and
2 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more.
3 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were also not provided
4 with one hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF
5 and other CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper
6 rest periods by DEFENDANTS and DEFENDANTS' managers. When DEFENDANTS provided
7 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members with rest break, they
8 required PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members to stay on
9 DEFENDANTS' premises for those rest breaks.

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

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

18 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS**
20 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226 and 226.2)**

21 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
22 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

26 97. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
27 "accurate itemized" statement in writing showing:

- 28 a. Gross wages earned;

- b. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
- c. The number of piece rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;
- d. All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
- e. Net wages earned;
- f. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
- g. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a 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.

98. Cal. Labor Code § 226.2 provides that an employer must furnish piece-rate employees with an “accurate itemized” statement in writing showing:

- a. The total hours of compensable rest and recovery periods, the rate of compensation, and the gross wages paid for those periods during the pay period; and
- b. The total hours of other nonproductive time, the rate of compensation, and the gross wages paid for that time during the pay period.

99. When DEFENDANTS did not accurately record PLAINTIFF’S and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ wages, including overtime wages, owed, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with complete

1 and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct overtime rate,
2 the correct number of hours worked, missed meal and rest periods, owed to PLAINTIFF and other
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall
4 furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing,
5 among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
6 period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Aside from the
7 violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an
8 itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.*
9 From time to time DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2) by failing
10 to provide an accurate amount of total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS. Specifically, DEFENDANTS included items, including but not limited
12 to “California Meal” to the total hours worked. However, the foregoing item is not considered
13 total hours worked for purposes of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(2). Further,
14 DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage statement to PLAINTIFF and
15 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that included the total hours worked at the
16 applicable hourly rate. Finally, DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to issue an itemized wage
17 statement that included the name of the legal entity that is the employer of PLAINTIFF and other
18 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. As a result, from time to time DEFENDANTS provided
19 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements which
20 violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

21 100. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Labor
22 Code § 226, causing injury and damages to the PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
23 CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs
24 expended calculating the correct rates for the overtime worked and the amount of employment
25 taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult
26 to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
27 CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period
28 in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a

1 subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the
2 time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and
3 each respective member of the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS herein).

4 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRES EXPENSES**

6 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

7 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
8 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES WHEN DUE**
12 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§201, 202, 203)**

13 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS and against all**
14 **DEFENDANTS)**

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

18 106. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

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

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

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

27 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
28 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.

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

110. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

111. The employment of PLAINTIFF and many CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-CLASS Members terminated and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of wages, to these employees who missed meal and rest breaks, as required by law.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF pray for a judgment against each DEFENDANTS, 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 DEFENDANTS from engaging in similar unlawful conduct as set forth herein;
- c. An order requiring DEFENDANTS to pay all wages and all sums unlawfully

1 withheld from compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS; and

3 d. Restitutionary disgorgement of DEFENDANT'S' ill-gotten gains into a fluid fund
4 for restitution of the sums incidental to DEFENDANTS' violations due to
5 PLAINTIFF and to the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS.

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

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

10 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
11 damages for minimum wages, overtime wages, unreimbursed expenses, and other
12 compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
13 LABOR SUB-CLASS, during the applicable CALIFORNIA LABOR SUB-
14 CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;

15 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
16 the applicable IWC Wage Order;

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

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

25 3. On all claims:

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

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

28 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,

1 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, §1194, §1197
2 and/or §2802.

3
4 DATED: _____, 2021

5
6 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

7 By: _____

8 Shani O. Zakay
9 Attorney for Plaintiffs

10 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

11
12 PLAINTIFF demands a jury trial on issues triable to a jury.

13 DATED: _____, 2021

14 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

15
16 By: _____

17
18 Shani O. Zakay
19 Attorney for Plaintiffs

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

EAH INC.
c/o Laura Hall
22 Pelican Way
San Rafael, CA 94901



9590 9402 5466 9249 9955 47

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7019 1640 0000 6893 9058

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

Rodriguez. 4/5/2021

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt