

SUMMONS

(CITACION JUDICIAL)

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

UNITED SECURITY SPECIALISTS, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

JOSUE CEBALLES, on behalf of the State of California in his representative capacity as a private attorney general,

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. **¡AVISO!** Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): San Francisco Superior Court

Civic Center Courthouse - 400 McAllister Street San Francisco, CA 94102

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

CGC-24-619120

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. T: (619)599-8292 JCL Law Firm, APC - 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE:
(Fecha) **10/21/2024**

Clerk, by **SAHAR ENAYATI**, Deputy
(Secretario) (Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

- ☐ as an individual defendant.
- ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
- ☐ on behalf of (specify):
under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation) ☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)
☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) ☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) ☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
☐ other (specify):
- ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
shani@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CGC-24-619120

JOSUE CEBALLES, on behalf of the State of
California in his representative capacity as a
private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED SECURITY SPECIALISTS, INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No:

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) VIOLATIONS OF THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT [LABOR
CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ.

**ELECTRONICALLY
FILED**

*Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco*

10/21/2024
Clerk of the Court

BY: SAHAR ENAYATI
Deputy Clerk

1 PLAINTIFF JOSUE CEBALLES ("PLAINTIFF") on behalf of the people of the State of
2 California, and as an "aggrieved employee" acting as a private attorney general under the Labor
3 Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* ("PAGA") only, alleges on information
4 and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the
5 following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against UNITED SECURITY SPECIALISTS,
8 INC., ("DEFENDANT" and/or "DEFENDANTS") seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties
9 on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT.
10 PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by**
11 **California Labor Code § 2699.** To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage
12 violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those
13 violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

14 2. California has enacted the PAGA which permits PLAINTIFF to bring an action on
15 behalf of others for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole nature of this action.

16 3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for DEFENDANT'S
17 violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA that is, penalties and any
18 other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to PAGA. Nothing in this complaint should be
19 constructed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in a PAGA- only action.

20 4. PLAINTIFF is not suing in his individual capacity; he is proceeding herein solely
21 under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees, including
22 himself and other aggrieved employees. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as
23 PLAINTIFF suing his individual capacity

24 5. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT
25 decreased their employment-related costs by systematically violating California wage and hour
26 laws.

27 6. DEFENDANT'S systematic pattern of wage and hour and IWC Wage Order
28 violations toward PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees in California include, *inter alia*:

- a. Failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods;
- b. Failure to allow employees to take duty-free meal and rest periods;
- c. Failure to pay all minimum, sick pay, regular and overtime wages;
- d. Failure to correctly calculate the regular rate of pay;
- e. Failure to pay within seven (7) days of the close of payroll;
- f. Failure to pay for all hours worked;
- g. Failure to maintain true and accurate records;
- h. Failure to reimburse for required business expenses;
- i. Failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- j. Failure to timely pay wages due during, and upon termination of employment.

7. PLAINTIFF reserves the right to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

THE PARTIES

8. Defendant UNITED SECURITY SPECIALISTS, INC. (“Defendant”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

9. DEFENDANT was the employer of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for.

10. DEFENDANT operates a security company throughout the state of California, including in the county of San Francisco.

11. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California since July 2022, paid in part an hourly wage, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

12. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to herself and all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California

1 (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of August 14, 2023, and the present
2 (“PAGA Period”).

3 13. PLAINTIFF is an “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE” within the meaning of Labor
4 Code § 2699(c) because he was employed by DEFENDANT and personally suffered each of the
5 alleged Labor Code violations committed by DEFENDANT.

6 14. PLAINTIFF and all other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are, and at all relevant
7 times were, employees of DEFENDANT, within the meanings set forth in the California Labor
8 Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

9 15. Each of the fictitiously named defendants participated in the acts alleged in this
10 Complaint. The true names and capacities of the Defendants named as DOES 1 THROUGH 50,
11 inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF. PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint, setting
12 forth the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named Defendants when their true names
13 are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the
14 fictitious Defendants have participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint.

15 16. DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 THROUGH 50 (hereinafter collectively
16 “DEFENDANTS”), were PLAINTIFF’S employers or persons acting on behalf of PLAINTIFF’S
17 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
18 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
19 hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as such, are
20 subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558, at all
21 relevant times.

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

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

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

6
7
8
9
10

11

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

1 the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against
2 DEFENDANT, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

3 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

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

1 EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. DEFENDANT's
2 failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members with legally
3 required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. PLAINTIFF and
4 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and
5 in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

6 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

22 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

23 24. DEFENDANT as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure,
24 intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF
25 and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by the
26 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of discharging their
27 duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are
28 required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their

1 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her
2 employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence
3 of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer,
4 even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
5 to be unlawful."

6 25. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
7 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell phones
8 and personal vehicles as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically,
9 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to use their own cell phones
10 and vehicles in order to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed
11 to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the personal expenses
12 incurred for the use of their personal cell phones and vehicles. As a result, in the course of their
13 employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
14 incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to
15 the use of their personal cell phones and vehicles, all on behalf of and for the benefit of
16 DEFENDANT.

17 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

26 27. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
27 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed
28 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also failed

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

6 28. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
7 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members with itemized wage statements that
8 provide the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, in violation of Cal. Lab.
9 Code § 226(a)(8).

10 29. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
11 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
12 Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).

13 30. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
14 with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT's violations are
15 knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional payroll error due to clerical or
16 inadvertent mistake.

17 **E. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

18 31. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
19 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours
20 worked.

21 32. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
22 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including
23 but not limited to, sending emails, filling out forms, and communicating with supervisors. This
24 resulted in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to have to work while off-the-clock.

25 33. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
26 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

27 34. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
28 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

1 35. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to document, track,
3 or pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages earned and owed for all the work
4 they performed.

5 36. PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were non-exempt employees,
6 subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

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

12 38. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
13 EMPLOYEES' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

14 39. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to
15 them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and benefit for the time spent
16 working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, sending emails, filling out forms, and
17 communicating with supervisors. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to not pay
18 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in accordance with
19 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

20 **F. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**
21 **and Redeemed Sick Pay**

22 40. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and continues
23 to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
24 for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed
25 sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages
26 due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time
27 rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. DEFENDANT's uniform
28 policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members at the

1 correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
2 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
3 records.

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

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

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

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

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

15 **G. Sick Pay Violations**

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

22 46. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its
23 employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.
24 From time to time, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 246 by failing to furnish PLAINTIFF
25 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick
26 leave available.

27
28 ///

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

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

7 48. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, “If an employer discharges an employee, the
8 wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.” Pursuant to
9 Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, “his or her wages shall become
10 due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours
11 previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her
12 wages at the time of quitting.” PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from time
13 to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or at
14 the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202. Further, DEFENDANT’s
15 violations are willful and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional payroll error due
16 to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

17 49. As such, PLAINTIFF demands up to thirty days of pay as penalty for not timely
18 paying all wages due at time of termination for all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose
19 employment ended during the PAGA PERIOD.

20 **I. Unlawful Deductions**

21 50. DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
22 and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES’ pay without explanations and without authorization to do so
23 or notice to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members. As a result,
24 DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code § 221.

25 **J. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

26 51. During the PAGA Period, DEFENDANT did not have in place an immutable
27 timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
28 EMPLOYEES for the actual time these employees worked each day, including overtime hours.

1 Specifically, DEFENDANT had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice that resulted
2 in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES being undercompensated for all of their time
3 worked. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round
4 the time recorded in DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
5 EMPLOYEES in order to avoid paying these employees for all their time worked, including the
6 applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other
7 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked
8 by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the
9 applicable overtime rates.

10 52. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system and unlawful
11 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' time
12 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT'S unlawful rounding
13 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work as
14 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
15 duty meal break.

16 **K. Timekeeping Manipulation**

17 53. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
18 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
19 EMPLOYEES for the actual time PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked each
20 day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal and rest breaks. As a result,
21 DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally alter the time recorded in
22 DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in order
23 to avoid paying these employees for all hours worked, applicable overtime compensation,
24 applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed rest break.

25 54. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time-to-time,
26 forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without
27 compensation at the applicable pay rates.

28 ///

1 55. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANT to alter
2 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANT'S
3 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
4 EMPLOYEES clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees were not
5 at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of DEFENDANT's
6 uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30) minute off-duty meal
7 breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

8 56. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due
9 them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT'S direction, control and benefit for the time the
10 timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANT'S uniform policy and practice to not pay
11 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in accordance with
12 applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT'S business records.

13 57. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
14 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods.
15 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)
16 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
17 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required
18 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF
19 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
20 DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
21 supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
22 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT'S strict corporate policy
23 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to
24 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT also failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF
25 for required business expenses related to the personal expenses incurred for the use of her personal
26 cell phone, personal vehicle and purchase of work uniforms, on behalf of and in furtherance of
27 her employment with DEFENDANT. To date, DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the
28 minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed

1 to her under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does
2 not exceed the sum or value of \$75,000.

3 **FIRST 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 58. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
8 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

9 59. 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 do 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
16 aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor
17 Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to
18 arbitration.

19 60. At all relevant times, for the reasons described herein, and others, PLAINTIFF and
20 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were aggrieved employees of DEFENDANT within the
21 meaning of Labor Code Section 2699(c).

22 61. Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (k) authorize an AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE,
23 like PLAINTIFF, on behalf of herself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil
24 action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code Section
25 2699.3

26 62. PLAINTIFF complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
27 Code Section 2699.3. By certified letter, return receipt requested, dated August 14, 2024,
28 PLAINTIFF gave written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA")

1 and to DEFENDANT of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated,
2 including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. See Exhibit #1.

3 63. As of the date of this complaint, more than sixty-five (65) days after serving the
4 LWDA with notice of DEFENDANT'S violations, the LWDA has not provided any notice by
5 certified mail of its intent to investigate the DEFENDANT'S alleged violations as mandated by
6 Labor Code Section 2699.3(a)(2)(A). Accordingly, pursuant to Labor Code Section
7 2699.3(a)(2)A, PLAINTIFF may commence and is authorized to pursue this cause of action.

8 64. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (f), PLAINTIFF and the
9 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to civil penalties for DEFENDANTS' violations of
10 Labor Code Section 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7,
11 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802,
12 and 2804 in the following amounts:

13 a. For violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and 204, up to (\$200)
14 per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period [penalty per Labor Code
15 Section 2699(f)];

16 b. For violations of Labor Code Section 226(a), a civil penalty in the amount
17 of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for
18 any initial violation and one thousand dollars for each subsequent violation
19 [penalty per Labor Code Section 226.3];

20 c. For violations of Labor Code Sections 204, a civil penalty in the amount of
21 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for any initial
22 violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for
23 each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 210];

24 d. For violations of Labor Code Sections 226.7, 510 and 512, a civil penalty
25 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid AGGRIEVED
26 EMPLOYEE for the initial violation and hundred dollars (\$100) for each
27 underpaid AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each subsequent violation [penalty
28 per Labor Code Section 558];

1 e. For violations of Labor Code Section 1174(d), a civil penalty in the amount
2 of five hundred (\$500) dollars for per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE [penalty per
3 Labor Code Section 1174.5].

4 f. For violations of Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198 and 1199,
5 a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) per AGGRIEVED
6 EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars
7 fifty (\$250) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent
8 violation [penalty per Labor Code Section].

9 65. For all provisions of the Labor Code for which civil penalty is not specifically
10 provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendant a penalty of up to two hundred dollars
11 (\$200) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
12 EMPLOYEES are entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs in connection with
13 their claims for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 2699(k)(1).

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

16 1. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit to the extent permitted by law,
17 including pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*;

18 2. For civil penalties to the extent permitted by law pursuant to the Labor Code under
19 the Private Attorneys General Act; and

20 3. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

21
22 DATED: October 21, 2024

23 **JCL LAW FIRM, APC**

24 By: _____

25 Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
26 Attorney for PLAINTIFF
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

August 14, 2024

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

UNITED SECURITY SPECIALISTS, INC.

c/o Kip Eardley
1793 Lafayette Street, 2nd Floor
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1756 9919 77

Re: Notice of Violations of California Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Our offices represent Plaintiff JOSUE CEBALLES (“Plaintiff”), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant UNITED SECURITY SPECIALISTS, INC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant since July of 2022 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to payment of all wages and the legally required meal and rest breaks, among other things. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all of their time worked, failed to pay employees at the correct regular rate of pay, when applicable, failed to reimburse employees for necessary business expenditures and for all of their meal and rest breaks. Further, Defendant failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for earned wages and failed to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with compliant meal and rest breaks.

As a consequence of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to him and other aggrieved employees, which among other violations of California Labor Code section 226(a). Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, violates the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.5.

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

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (1) identifies the alleged violations, (2) details the facts and theories which support the alleged

violations, (3) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (4) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (5) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

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

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

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with the Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2695, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other aggrieved employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees.

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

Very truly yours,
JCL LAW FIRM, APC

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Jean-Claude Lapuyade', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
shani@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

JOSUE CEBALLES, an individual, on behalf of
himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED SECURITY SPECIALISTS, 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;

- 1 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
2 DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
3 CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
4 8) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
5 FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN
6 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802.

7
8 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

9 PLAINTIFF JOSUE CEBALLES (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of himself and
10 all other similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief, except
11 for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

12 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

13 1. Defendant UNITED SECURITY SPECIALISTS, INC. (“DEFENDANT and/or
14 DEFENDANTS”) is a California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein
15 conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

16 2. DEFENDANT operates a security company in California, including in the county
17 of San Francisco, where PLAINTIFF worked.

18 3. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANT in California since July 2022
19 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and
20 rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

27 5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a CALIFORNIA
28 CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during
the CLASS PERIOD caused by DEFENDANT’s uniform policy and practice which failed to

1 lawfully compensate these employees. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice alleged
2 herein was an unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business practice whereby DEFENDANT retained
3 and continue to retain wages due PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
4 CLASS. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
5 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and the
6 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who have been economically injured by
7 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
8 relief.

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

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

26 8. DEFENDANT was PLAINTIFF's employers or persons acting on behalf of
27 PLAINTIFF's employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or
28 caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision

1 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as
2 such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558,
3 at all relevant times.

4 9. DEFENDANT was PLAINTIFF's employers or persons acting on behalf of
5 PLAINTIFF's employer either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person,
6 within the meaning of California Labor Code § 1197.1, who paid or caused to be paid to any
7 employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by California state law, and as such, are subject to
8 civil penalties for each underpaid employee.

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

12 11. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
13 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
14 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by
15 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
16 relief.

17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

26 **THE CONDUCT**

27 14. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
28 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a

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

20 **A. Meal Period Violations**

21 15. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was
22 required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked,
23 meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including
24 all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS
25 PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work
26 without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. Specifically,
27 DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be
28 PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not

1 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
2 forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time
3 being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
4 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
6 records.

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

24 **B. Rest Period Violations**

25 17. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other
26 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also required to work in excess of four (4) hours without
27 being provided ten (10) minute rest periods as a result of their rigorous work requirements and
28 DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing. Further, for the same reasons, these employees were denied

1 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four
2 (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some
3 shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and
4 third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from
5 time to time. When they were provided with rest breaks, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. PLAINTIFF
7 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were also not provided with one-hour wages *in lieu*
8 thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing,
9 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were from time to time denied their
10 proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

11 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

23 19. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
25 phones and vehicles as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF
26 and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to use their personal cell phones and
27 vehicles in order to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to
28 reimburse PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the use of their personal

cell phones and vehicles. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones and vehicles, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

D. Wage Statement Violations

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

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

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

23. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).

///

1 24. As a result, DEFENDANT issued PLAINTIFF and other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).
3 Further, DEFENDANT's violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an
4 unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

5 **E. Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations**

6 25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
7 continue to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
8 for all hours worked.

9 26. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
10 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
11 work, including but not limited to, sending emails, filling out forms, and communicating with
12 supervisors. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 having to work while off-the-clock.

14 27. DEFENDANT directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-
15 clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

16 28. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
17 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
18 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

19 29. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
20 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
21 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
22 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

1 eight (8) hours per day, DEFENDANT's policies and practices also deprived them of overtime
2 pay.

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

5 33. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and
7 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, sending
8 emails, filling out forms, and communicating with supervisors. DEFENDANT's uniform policy
9 and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all
10 hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
11 records.

12 **F. Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums,**
13 **and Redeemed Sick Pay**

14 34. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and continue
15 to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
16 for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed
17 sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members forfeited wages
18 due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time
19 rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. DEFENDANT's uniform
20 policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at the correct rate for all
21 overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay in accordance
22 with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

27 36. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 Members' compensation was DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that paid

1 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
2 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
3 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various
4 performance goals set by DEFENDANT.

5 37. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay
6 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members worked overtime, double
7 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
8 discretionary bonuses, DEFENDANT failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
9 compensation as part of the employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
10 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
11 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
12 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
13 CLASS Members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted
14 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
15 premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
16 Members by DEFENDANT. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid
17 sick time for non-exempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of
18 pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the
19 employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANT's conduct, as articulated
20 herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for
21 purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of
22 which is recoverable under Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201, 202, 203, and/or 204.

23 38. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
24 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
25 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to
26 compensate PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS at the correct rate
27 of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed
28 sick pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANT to illegally profit and gain

1 an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling
2 operates to toll claims by the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members against DEFENDANT, the
3 CLASS PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

4 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

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

9 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

10 40. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT, from time-to-time, did not have an
11 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of
12 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
13 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
14 and rest breaks. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and
15 unilaterally alter the time recorded in DEFENDANT's timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and
16 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all
17 hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and
18 missed rest breaks.

19 41. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
20 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
21 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

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

1 43. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
2 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control and
3 benefit for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANT's uniform policy
4 and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for
5 all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
6 records.

7 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

16 49. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that “An employee who, on or after
17 July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from
18 the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section.”
19 Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From
20 time to time, DEFENDANT failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided PLAINTIFF
21 and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with sick days and/or paid sick leave. As of
22 January 1, 2024, Defendant failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide and allow
23 employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

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

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

19 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

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

25 53. PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have uniformly been
26 deprived of wages and penalties from unpaid wages earned and due, including but not limited to
27 unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid meal and rest period premiums,
28 illegal meal and rest period policies, failed to reimburse for business expenses, failed compensate

1 for off-the-clock work, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to maintain
2 required records, and interest, statutory and civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and expenses.

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

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

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

27
28 ///

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

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

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

12 56. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
13 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

14 57. PLAINTIFF's claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
15 PLAINTIFF has the same interests as the other members of the class.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Business Practices

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

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against Defendant)

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

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

///

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

22 **(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against Defendant)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

17 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

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

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

- c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an employee identification number other than social security number may be shown on the itemized statement,
- h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

119. When DEFENDANT did not accurately record PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurate missed meal and rest break premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226 in that DEFENDANT failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the accurate gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, and correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods.

120. Further, from time to time, DEFENDANT issued wage statements that included items such as vacation pay, meal break penalties, sick pay and double-counted shift differential payments into the calculation for total hours worked, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2).

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

122. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the requirements of California Labor Code Section 226(a)(1)-(9).

123. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(1)-(9), causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Pay Wages When Due

(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against Defendant)

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

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

As used in this article:

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

///

1 126. Cal. Lab. Code § 201 provides, in relevant part, that “If an employer discharges
2 an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
3 immediately.”

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

5 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
6 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
7 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
8 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
9 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.

10 128. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF’s or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
11 Members’ employment contract.

12 129. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

13 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with
14 Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who
15 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.

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

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

24
25
26
27
28 ///

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

5 132. 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.

8 133. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:
9 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
10 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
11 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.

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
- b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
- c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;

- 1 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in
2 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding
4 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for
5 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226
- 6 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
7 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
8 therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 9 f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
10 CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.
- 11 3. On all claims:
- 12 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 13 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- 14 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
15 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, § 246 and/or
16 § 1194.

17
18 DATED: August 14, 2024

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

19 By: 

20 Jean Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
21 Attorney for PLAINTIFF
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

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

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

DATED: August 14, 2024

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: 
Jean Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT