

SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)

SUM-100

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

ELECTRONICALLY FILED BY
Superior Court of California,
County of Monterey
On 10/24/2024 5:50 PM
By: Errol Rimando, Deputy

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

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

PETRA RIOS, on behalf of the State of California in her 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): Monterey Superior Court
Monterey Courthouse - 1200 Aguajito Road, Monterey, CA 93940

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

24CV004490

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: 10/25/2024
(Fecha)

Clerk, by /s/ Errol Rimando, 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

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.
2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3. ☐ 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):
4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

PETRA RIOS, on behalf of the State of
California in her representative capacity as a
private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

v.

PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 24CV004490

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:

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

1 PLAINTIFF PETRA RIOS ("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 her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the
5 following:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES,
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
15 on 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 her individual capacity; she is proceeding herein solely
21 under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees, including
22 herself and other aggrieved employees. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as
23 PLAINTIFF suing her 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 PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC. (“DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANTS”) 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 janitorial services in California, including in the county of Monterey, where PLAINTIFF worked.

11. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from July of 2023 to September of 2023, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and

1 classified as non-exempt employees (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of
2 August 20, 2023, and the present (“PAGA Period”).

3 13. PLAINTIFF is an “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE” within the meaning of Labor
4 Code § 2699(c) because she 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. DEFENDANT was 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 toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against DEFENDANT, the PAGA PERIOD
2 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 when PLAINTIFF did not even receive a
12 partial lunch. As a result, 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 and/or were
2 interrupted to perform work and/or were required to truncate meal periods to perform work as
3 demanded by DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the
4 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by
5 DEFENDANT's business records. PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore
6 forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's
7 strict corporate policy and practice.

8 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

23 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

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

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

19 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

1 27. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, when PLAINTIFF and other
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed
3 meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, DEFENDANT also failed
4 to provide PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage
5 statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours worked and
6 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding amount of time
7 worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest
8 periods.

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

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

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

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

20 31. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
21 PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including
22 but not limited to, cleaning, opening and closing keyholder duties and performing security sweeps.
23 This resulted in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work while off-the-clock.

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

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

1 34. 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 35. PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were non-exempt employees,
6 subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code.

7 36. 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 37. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED
13 EMPLOYEES' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

14 38. 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 perform pre-shift or post-shift work,
17 including but not limited to, cleaning, opening and closing keyholder duties and performing
18 security sweeps. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and
19 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is
20 evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

23 39. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and continues
24 to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for
25 their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick
26 pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to
27 them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time rates,
28 meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy

1 and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members at the correct
2 rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick
3 pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

4 40. 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 41. 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 42. 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, DEFENDANT 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 DEFENDANT. Specifically, California
25 Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time for non-employees shall be calculated in the
26 same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses
27 paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek.
28 DEFENDANT'S conduct, as articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as

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

4 43. 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 44. 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 45. 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 46. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
3 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment.
4 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time, did not receive payment
5 of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period
6 premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

7 47. 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 48. 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 49. DEFENDANT, 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. As a result, DEFENDANT
24 violated Labor Code § 221.

25 **J. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

26 50. 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 51. 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 52. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT, 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 breaks.

25 53. 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 54. 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 breaks when in fact the employees were
5 not 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 55. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to
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 are evidenced by DEFENDANT'S business records.

13 56. 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's 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 upkeep of her 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 57. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
8 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

9 58. 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 59. 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 60. 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 61. PLAINTIFF complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor
27 Code Section 2699.3. By certified letter, return receipt requested, dated August 20, 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 62. 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 63. Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2699(a) and (f), PLAINTIFF and the
9 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to civil penalties for DEFENDANT'S 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,
11 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199,
12 2802 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 and fifty
7 dollars (\$250) per AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each
8 subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section].

9 64. 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 DEFENDANT 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 24, 2024

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

23 By: 

24 Andrea Amaya
25 Attorney for PLAINTIFF
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

August 20, 2024

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

PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC.

c/o Hector M. Marquez
557 Brunken Ave., Ste. G
Salinas, CA 93901

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1756 9919 84

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 PETRA RIOS ("Plaintiff"), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC. ("Defendant"). Plaintiff was employed by Defendant from July 2023 to September 2023 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 her and other aggrieved employees, 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 her 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)
Monnett De La Torre (State Bar #272884)
Andrea A. Amaya Silva (State Bar #348080)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
mdelatorre@jcl-lawfirm.com
aamaya@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 MONTEREY

PETRA RIOS, an individual, on behalf of
herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, 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 PETRA RIOS (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and all other
10 similarly situated current and former employees, alleges on information and belief, except for her
11 own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

12 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

13 1. Defendant PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC. (“DEFENDANT”) is a
14 California corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to
15 conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

16 2. DEFENDANT operates janitorial services in California, including in the county of
17 Monterey, where PLAINTIFF worked.

18 3. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from July of 2023 to
19 September of 2023 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally
20 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
21 worked.

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

28 5. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a CALIFORNIA
CLASS in order to fully compensate the CALIFORNIA CLASS for their losses incurred during

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

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

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

27 8. DEFENDANT was PLAINTIFF's employer or persons acting on behalf of
28 PLAINTIFF's employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or

1 caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision
2 regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission and, as
3 such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee, as set forth in Labor Code § 558,
4 at all relevant times.

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

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

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

18 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

27
28 ///

THE CONDUCT

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

A. Meal Period Violations

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

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

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

27
28 ///

1 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

16 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

28 ///

1 19. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell
3 phones and vehicles and the upkeep of their uniforms as a result of and in furtherance of their
4 job duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required
5 to use their personal cell phones and vehicles and maintain their uniforms in order to perform
6 work related tasks. However, DEFENDANT unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and
7 other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the use of their personal cell phones and vehicles and
8 for the upkeep of their uniforms. As a result, in the course of their employment with
9 DEFENDANT, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incurred
10 unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of
11 their personal cell phones and vehicles, and the upkeep of their uniforms, all on behalf of and for
12 the benefit of DEFENDANT.

13 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

1 amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed
2 meal and rest periods.

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

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

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

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

14 25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
15 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
16 work, including but not limited to, cleaning, opening and closing keyholder duties and performing
17 security sweeps. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
18 having to work while off-the-clock.

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

11 32. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
12 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and
13 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, cleaning,
14 opening and closing keyholder duties and performing security sweeps. DEFENDANT's uniform
15 policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages
16 for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
17 records.

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

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

1 34. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times
2 their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were
3 compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an
4 employee’s performance.

5 35. The second component of PLAINTIFF’s and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
6 Members’ compensation was DEFENDANT’s non-discretionary incentive program that paid
7 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members incentive wages based on their
8 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees
9 paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various
10 performance goals set by DEFENDANT.

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

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

10 **G. Unlawful Deductions**

11 38. DEFENDANT, from time-to-time unlawfully deducted wages from PLAINTIFF
12 and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' pay without explanations and without authorization to do
13 so or notice to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. As a result, DEFENDANT
14 violated Labor Code § 221.

15 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

25 40. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
26 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
27 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

28 ///

1 41. 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 other members of the
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees
5 were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of
6 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
7 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

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

14 **I. Unlawful Rounding Practices**

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

27 44. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT's timekeeping system and unlawful
28 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' time

1 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT's unlawful rounding
2 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
3 as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
4 duty meal break.

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

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

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

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

22 **K. Sick Pay Violations**

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

1 January 1, 2024, Defendant failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide and allow
2 employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

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

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

26 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

27 51. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself, and a California class
28 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California and

1 classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period
2 beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined
3 by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD").

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

10 53. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
11 impractical.

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

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

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

17 55. PLAINTIFF is a member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
18 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

19 56. PLAINTIFF's claims are typical of the claims of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, and
20 PLAINTIFF has the same interests as the other members of the class.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24
25
26
27
28 ///

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

5 64. 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 65. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.
9 Code § 17021.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

28 ///

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

5 79. 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 80. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim
9 for DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the
10 Industrial Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate
11 and pay minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

16 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

21 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

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

28 ///

1 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

5 113. 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.

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

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

27
28 ///

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

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements

(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS against Defendant)

117. 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.

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

- a. Gross wages earned,
- b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission,
- c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- e. net wages earned,
- f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
- g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number 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. 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).

121. 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).

///

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

3 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

5 122. 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.

8 123. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

9 As used in this article:

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

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

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

20 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her
21 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours
22 thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention
23 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.
24 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
25 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and
26 designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment
27 for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of
28 quitting.

29 126. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF's or any CALIFORNIA CLASS
30 Members' employment contract.

31 127. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

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

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

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

16 131. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 provides, in relevant part, that:
17 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
18 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
19 duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though
 unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them
 to be unlawful.

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

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

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

13 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

16 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

27 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 28 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth

Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;

- b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest thereon at the statutory rate;
 - c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
 - d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;
 - e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
 - f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.
3. On all claims:
- a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
 - b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
 - c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, § 246 and/or § 1194.

DATED: August 20, 2024

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: 

Jean-Claude Lapuyade
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

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 20, 2024

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: 
Jean-Claude Lapuyade
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1