

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

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

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

LYNN TARANTO, an individual, on behalf of
 herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
 situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS EL SEGUNDO,
 LP, a California limited partnership; SAUCED
 BBQ & SPIRITS IRVINE, LP, a California
 limited partnership; SAUCED BBQ &
 SPIRITS LIVERMORE, LLC, a California
 limited liability company; SAUCED BBQ &
 SPIRITS SACRAMENTO, L.P., a California
 limited partnership; SAUCED BBQ &
 SPIRITS SANTANA ROW, LP, a California
 limited partnership; SAUCED BBQ &
 SPIRITS WALNUT CREEK, L.P., a California
 limited partnership; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 23STCV19186

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
 COMPLAINT FOR:**

- 1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION
 OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 *et*
seq;
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN
 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§
 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
- 3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES
 IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§
 510, *et seq*;
- 4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED
 MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF
 CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND
 THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED
 REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL.
 LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE
 APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles
10/23/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: M. Arellanes Deputy

- 1 6) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
2 FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN
3 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
4 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
5 DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
6 CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
7 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
8 ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN
9 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
10 9) FAILURE TO PROVIDE GRATUITIES IN
11 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 351.
12 10) VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE
13 ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT LABOR
14 CODE §§ 2698 ET SEQ.

15 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

16 PLAINTIFF LYNN TARANTO (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and all
17 other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for
18 her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

19 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

20 1. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS EL SEGUNDO, LP (“Defendant Suced
21 El Segundo) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned herein
22 conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

23 2. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS IRVINE, LP (“Defendant Suced Irvine”) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and
24 continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

25 3. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS LIVERMORE, LLC (“Defendant Suced
26 Livermore”) is a California limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein
27 conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

28 4. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS SACRAMENTO, L.P. (“Defendant
Suced Sacramento”) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned herein
conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

5. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS SANTANA ROW, LP (“Defendant Suced
Santana Row”) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned herein
conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

1 6. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS WALNUT CREEK, L.P. (“Defendant
2 Sauced Walnut Creek”) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned
3 herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4 7. PLAINTIFF alleges there has existed a unity of interest and ownership between
5 Defendants such that any individuality and separateness between the entities has ceased and all
6 Defendants are referred to herein as “DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

7 8. PLAINTIFF alleges that DOES 1-50 are the partners, agents, owners, or managers
8 of DEFENDANT at all relevant times. PLAINTIFF alleges there has existed a unity of interest
9 and ownership between Defendant Sauced El Segundo, Defendant Sauced Irvine, Defendant
10 Sauced Livermore, Defendant Sauced Sacramento, Defendant Sauced Santana Row and
11 Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek such that any individuality and separateness between the entities
12 has ceased. Defendant Sauced El Segundo, Defendant Sauced Irvine, Defendant Sauced
13 Livermore, Defendant Sauced Sacramento, Defendant Sauced Santana Row and Defendant
14 Sauced Walnut Creek are therefore alter egos of each other. Adherence to the fiction of the
15 separate existence of DEFENDANT would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege, and would
16 promote injustice by protecting DEFENDANT from liability for the wrongful acts committed by
17 them.

18 9. PLAINTIFF further alleges that DEFENDANT are the alter egos of each other for
19 the following reasons:

- 20 a. On the California Secretary of State’s website (<https://businesssearch.sos.ca.gov/>)
21 Defendant Sauced El Segundo, Defendant Sauced Irvine, Defendant Sauced
22 Livermore, Defendant Sauced Sacramento, Defendant Sauced Santana Row and
23 Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek have the same entity address and/or mailing
24 address and/or Agent for Service of Process;
- 25 b. On information and belief Defendant Sauced El Segundo, Defendant Sauced
26 Irvine, Defendant Sauced Livermore, Defendant Sauced Sacramento, Defendant
27 Sauced Santana Row and Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek utilize the same
28 standardized employment forms and issue the same employment policies and same
pay stubs;

1 c. On information and belief Defendant Sourced El Segundo, Defendant Sourced
2 Irvine, Defendant Sourced Livermore, Defendant Sourced Sacramento, Defendant
3 Sourced Santana Row and Defendant Sourced Walnut Creek have an executive team
4 which supervise and manage the operations of all of DEFENDANT's restaurants,
5 supervised and managed the finances of all of DEFENDANT's restaurants,
6 supervised and managed the marketing of all of DEFENDANT's restaurants,
7 supervised and managed the human resources of all of DEFENDANT's
8 restaurants, and supervised and managed the food and beverage offerings at all of
9 DEFENDANT's restaurants.

10 10. PLAINTIFF alleges that DEFENDANT's various separate corporate entities are
11 used by an individual or individuals, or by another corporation, to accomplish inequitable
12 purposes, including to limit liability for the unlawful acts of DEFENDANT.

13 11. PLAINTIFF alleges that there is such a unity of interest and ownership between
14 DEFENDANT's various corporate entities that own DEFENDANT's restaurants and the
15 individual or individuals, or organization controlling those corporate entities that their separate
16 personalities no longer exist.

17 12. PLAINTIFF further alleges that the failure to disregard the various corporate
18 entities would promote injustice.

19 13. Defendant Sourced El Segundo, Defendant Sourced Irvine, Defendant Sourced
20 Livermore, Defendant Sourced Sacramento, Defendant Sourced Santana Row and Defendant
21 Sourced Walnut Creek were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents
22 issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are
23 therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as "DEFENDANTS"
24 and/or "DEFENDANT."

25 14. DEFENDANTS own, operate, and/or manage Sourced BBQ & Spirits restaurants
26 throughout the state of California, including in the county of Los Angeles, where PLAINTIFF
27 worked.

28 15. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from August of 2022
to March of 2023 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis and entitled to the legally

1 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
2 worked.

3 16. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
4 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Suced El Segundo
5 and/or Defendant Suced Irvine and/or Defendant Suced Livermore and/or Defendant Suced
6 Sacramento and/or Defendant Suced Santana Row and/or Defendant Suced Walnut Creek in
7 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time
8 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
9 date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the
10 aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
11 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

23 18. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
24 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
25 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious
26 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this
27 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are
28 ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief

1 alleges, that the DEFENDANTS named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,
2 inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that
3 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

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

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

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

26 23. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
27 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
28 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by

1 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
2 relief.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

12 **THE CONDUCT**

13 26. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
14 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
15 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically
16 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate
17 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest
18 periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
19 time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
22 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse
23 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue
24 to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage
25 statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
26 periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT's
27 uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment
28 for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit

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

4 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

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

duty” meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. DEFENDANT’s failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’s strict corporate policy and practice.

B. Rest Period Violations

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

C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses

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

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

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

19 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

28 ///

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

9 34. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
10 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
11 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

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

17 36. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
18 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 for all hours worked.

20 37. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
21 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
22 work, including but not limited to, performing security sweeps of DEFENDANT's restaurant,
23 cleaning and closing up the restaurant. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

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

27 ///
28

1 39. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
2 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

4 40. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
5 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
6 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
7 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

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

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

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

26 45. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
27 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and

1 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
2 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
3 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
4 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at
5 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
6 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
7 records.

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

12 47. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid
14 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for
15 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
16 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
17 DEFENDANTS.

18 48. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay
19 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double
20 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
21 discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
22 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
23 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
24 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
25 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
26 CLASS members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted
27 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
28 premiums, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members by

1 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time
2 for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
3 workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee
4 actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as articulated herein, by
5 failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of
6 sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is
7 recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

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

19 **G. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

20 50. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT did not have in place
21 an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including
23 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANT had in place an unlawful rounding policy and
24 practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
25 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in
26 fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system
27 for PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these
28 employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime

1 worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF, and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from time to time,
2 forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately
3 recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

4 51. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system and unlawful
5 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' time
6 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT'S unlawful rounding
7 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
8 as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
9 duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANT'S unlawful rounding policy and practice caused
10 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
11 for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty meal break.

12 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

22 53. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
23 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
24 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

25 54. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
26 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
27 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees

1 were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of
2 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
3 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

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

10 **I. Sick Pay Violations**

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

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

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

23 58. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
25 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
26 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
27 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.
28

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

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

12 **K. Tip Pooling**

13 61. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS period, pursuant to DEFENDANTS’ company
14 policies and practices, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to
15 forfeit gratuities left for them by customers to DEFENDANTS’ agents who provided no service
16 to the customers that resulted in the gratuity. DEFENDANTS routinely added gratuity tips and
17 service charges to its food and beverage bills. These gratuities and service charges reasonably
18 appear to be gratuities for the service staff. It is typical and customary in the hospitality industry
19 that establishments impose gratuity charges on the food and beverage bill. Thus, when customers
20 paid these charges, it is reasonable for them to have believed they were gratuities to be paid to the
21 service staff. Indeed, because many of these charges are depicted to customers, and the custom in
22 the food and beverage industry that gratuities are paid for food and beverage service, customers
23 paid these charges reasonably believing they were remitted to the service staff. However,
24 DEFENDANTS have not remitted the total proceeds of these gratuities to the non-managerial
25 employees who serve the food and beverages. Instead, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice
26 of using a portion of these gratuities to pay managers or other non-service employees. As a result,
27 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have not received the total proceeds of the
28 gratuities, to which they are entitled to under California law.

1 62. DEFENDANTS are generally in the business of owning and operating a restaurant.
2 During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
3 Members were in the “chain of service” and earned gratuities based on their service for their
4 customers. However, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to forfeit
5 portions of their gratuities, which said gratuities were kept by DEFENDANTS’ employees who
6 were not in the chain of service from which the gratuity resulted. PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members contend that any gratuities kept by DEFENDANTS’ non-
8 service employees were illegal and in violation of California law because PLAINTIFF and other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members provided the service for to whom the gratuity should have been
10 paid.

11 63. California Labor Code § 351 establishes the requirements for an employer
12 regarding the payment of gratuities. Specifically, gratuities are the sole property of the employees.
13 California Labor Code § 351 expressly prohibits employers and their agents from collecting,
14 taking, or receiving any portion of a gratuity. California Labor Code § 350(e) defines the term
15 “gratuity” as including any money that has been paid or given or left for an employee by a patron
16 of a business over and above the actual amount due the business for services rendered or for
17 goods, food, drink or articles sold or served to such patron. Labor Code § 353 requires employers
18 to keep accurate records of all gratuities they receive, directly or indirectly.

19 64. Although tip pooling is not expressly prohibited by the Labor Code, employees
20 who mandate tip pooling must only distribute pooled tips to employees in the “chain of service.”
21 By distributing tips to employees who were not in the “chain of service,” DEFENDANTS have
22 violated and continue to violate the legal requirements for handling pooled tips.

23 65. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
24 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods.
25 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)
26 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
27 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required
28 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF

1 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
2 DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
3 supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
4 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’S strict corporate policy
5 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to
6 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for
7 required business expenses related to the use of her personal cell phone, in violation of Cal. Lab.
8 Code § 2802. To date, DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and
9 double time compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab.
10 Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or
11 value of \$75,000.

12 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

13 66. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of herself, and a California class
14 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Suced El Segundo
15 and/or Defendant Suced Irvine and/or Defendant Suced Livermore and/or Defendant Suced
16 Sacramento and/or Defendant Suced Santana Row and/or Defendant Suced Walnut Creek in
17 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time
18 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
19 date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

26 68. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
27 impractical.
28

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

- a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and practices;
- b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and practices;
- c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate overtime wages;
- e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit

of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to permit this work;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
2 create the risk of:

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

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

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

26 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may
27 be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such orders or
28 judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the
use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair competition, as
defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any

1 money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such
2 unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203).

3 82. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
4 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
5 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
6 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and
7 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.
8 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
9 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

24 85. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
25 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
26 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
27 DEFENDANT.

28 86. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide

1 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
2 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

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

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

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

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

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

27 92. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
28 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair,

1 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from
2 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

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

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

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

17 95. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
18 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
19 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay
20 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

1 99. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
2 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
3 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
4 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

6 100. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
7 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
8 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
9 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regard to minimum wage pay.

10 101. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
11 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
12 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANT acted
13 in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of
14 the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable
15 laws and regulations.

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

19 103. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
21 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

27 105. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.

1 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
2 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
3 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
4 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages
5 for their time worked.

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

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

25
26
27
28 ///

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

2

3

4

5
6
7

8
9
10
11
12

13
1415
16
17

18
19
20
21

22
23
24

25
26
27
28

1 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked,
2 including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
3 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

4 115. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
5 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
6 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal
7 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
8 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
9 regulations.

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

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

21 118. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked that they were entitled to, constituting
23 a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

1 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
2 witnessed by employees.

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

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

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

23 123. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 request recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
25 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
26 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is
27 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their
28 employment, DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore

1 these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
2 penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional,
3 and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are
4 entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

7 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

26 126. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
27 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
28 who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one

1 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a
2 meal period was not provided.

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

6 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

27 130. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
28 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members

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

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

7 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

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

15 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
16 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
17 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.

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

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

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

12 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

14 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

19 137. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

20 As used in this article:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

28 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

4 145. Cal. Labor Code § 226 provides that an employer must furnish employees with an
5 "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.

146. 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.

147. 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.

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

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY STATUTORY GRATUITIES

(Cal. Lab. Code § 351 et seq.)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS and against all

Defendants)

149. 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.

150. DEFENDANT's conduct, as set forth above, in failing to remit to non-managerial employees the total proceeds of gratuities added to customers' bills constitutes a violation of California Labor Code Section 351. This violation is enforceable pursuant to the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code 17200 et seq. DEFENDANT's conduct constitutes unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent business acts or practices, in that DEFENDANT has violated

1 California Labor Code Section 351 in not remitting to the non-managerial service employees the
2 total gratuities that were charged to customers.

3 151. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial,
5 including the loss of gratuities to which they were entitled. and seek all wages earned and due,
6 interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

7 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)**

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

11 152. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth
12 herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

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

22 154. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
23 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
24 Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to himself
25 and all individuals classified as all non-exempt employees who worked for DEFENDANTS in
26 California during the time period of August 11, 2022, until the present (the “AGGRIEVED
27 EMPLOYEES”).
28

1 155. On August 11, 2023, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by certified mail to the Labor
2 and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and the employer of the specific provisions
3 of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. See Exhibit #1,
4 attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting period for
5 Plaintiff to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section
6 2699.3, Plaintiff may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section
7 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as
8 herein defined.

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

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

thereon at the statutory rate;

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

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

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

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

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

///

1 4. On all claims:

- 2 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 3 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- 4 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
- 5 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, § 246 and/or
- 6 § 1194.

7

8 DATED: October 23, 2023

9 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

10 By: 
11 Shani O. Zakay
12 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

13

14 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

16

17

18 DATED: October 23, 2023

19 **ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC**

20 By: 
21 Shani O. Zakay
22 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

23

24

25

26

27

28

EXHIBIT 1



ZAKAY LAW GROUP
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Client # 65101

August 11, 2023

Via Online Filing to LWDA and Certified Mail to Defendants

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Online Filing

SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS EL SEGUNDO, LP

c/o Michael T. Krueger

1333 N California, Ste 600

Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0880 7025 41

SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS IRVINE, LP

c/o Michael Krueger

2033 N Main St, Suite 500

Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0880 7025 58

SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS LIVERMORE, LLC

c/o Barrett Gomes

2300 First St, Ste 220

Livermore, CA 94550

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9598 0710 5270 0880 7025 65

SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS SACRAMENTO, L.P.

SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS SANTANA ROW, LP

SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS WALNUT CREEK, L.P.

c/o Michael T Krueger

2121 N California Blvd, Ste 875

Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Via Certified U.S. Mail with Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0880 7025 72

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, 351, 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 LYNN TARANTO ("Plaintiff"), and other aggrieved employees in a proposed lawsuit against Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS EL SEGUNDO, LP ("Defendant Suced El Segundo), Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS IRVINE, LP ("Defendant Suced Irvine"), Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS LIVERMORE, LLC

("Defendant Sauced Livermore"), Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS SACRAMENTO, L.P. ("Defendant Sauced Sacramento"), Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS SANTANA ROW, LP ("Defendant Sauced Santana Row"), Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS WALNUT CREEK, L.P. ("Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek") (collectively, hereinafter, "Defendants".) Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from August of 2022 to March of 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. Defendants, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all of their time worked, and for all of their meal breaks and rest breaks. Further, Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for earned wages.

As a consequence of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff further contends that Defendants failed to provide accurate wage statements to her and other aggrieved employees, which among other violations of California Labor Code section 226(a). Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 351, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, violates the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as all non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant Sauced El Segundo and/or Defendant Sauced Irvine and/or Defendant Sauced Livermore and/or Defendant Sauced Sacramento and/or Defendant Sauced Santana Row and/or Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek in California during the relevant claim period.

A true and correct copy of the proposed Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendants, which (1) identifies the alleged violations, (2) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (3) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (4) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (5) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendants, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

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

Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this notice. Consequently, Defendants are on notice that Plaintiff continues 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 Defendants as authorized by California Labor Code section 2695, *et seq.* The lawsuit consists of other aggrieved employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims as alleged in the Complaint, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statue of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all aggrieved California employees.

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

Sincerely,

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

Shani O. Zakay
Attorney for Plaintiff

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

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

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

LYNN TARANTO, an individual, on behalf of
herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS EL SEGUNDO,
LP, a California limited partnership; SAUCED
BBQ & SPIRITS IRVINE, LP, a California
limited partnership; SAUCED BBQ &
SPIRITS LIVERMORE, LLC, a California
limited liability company; SAUCED BBQ &
SPIRITS SACRAMENTO, L.P., a California
limited partnership; SAUCED BBQ &
SPIRITS SANTANA ROW, LP, a California
limited partnership; SAUCED BBQ &
SPIRITS WALNUT CREEK, L.P., a California
limited partnership; 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;

- 1 6) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES
2 FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN
3 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
4 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN
5 DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB.
6 CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
7 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE
8 ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN
9 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226;
10 9) FAILURE TO PROVIDE GRATUITIES IN
11 VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 351.

12 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

13 PLAINTIFF LYNN TARANTO (“PLAINTIFF”), an individual, on behalf of herself and all
14 other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for
15 her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

16 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS**

17 1. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS EL SEGUNDO, LP (“Defendant Suced
18 El Segundo) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned herein
19 conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

20 2. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS IRVINE, LP (“Defendant Suced Irvine”) is a California limited
21 partnership that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and
22 continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

23 3. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS LIVERMORE, LLC (“Defendant Suced
24 Livermore”) is a California limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein
25 conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

26 4. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS SACRAMENTO, L.P. (“Defendant
27 Suced Sacramento”) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned herein
28 conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

5. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS SANTANA ROW, LP (“Defendant Suced
Santana Row”) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned herein
conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

1 6. Defendant SAUCED BBQ & SPIRITS WALNUT CREEK, L.P. (“Defendant
2 Sauced Walnut Creek”) is a California limited partnership that at all relevant times mentioned
3 herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

4 7. PLAINTIFF alleges there has existed a unity of interest and ownership between
5 Defendants such that any individuality and separateness between the entities has ceased and all
6 Defendants are referred to herein as “DEFENDANT” and/or “DEFENDANT.”

7 8. PLAINTIFF alleges that DOES 1-50 are the partners, agents, owners, or managers
8 of DEFENDANT at all relevant times. PLAINTIFF alleges there has existed a unity of interest
9 and ownership between Defendant Sauced El Segundo, Defendant Sauced Irvine, Defendant
10 Sauced Livermore, Defendant Sauced Sacramento, Defendant Sauced Santana Row and
11 Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek such that any individuality and separateness between the entities
12 has ceased. Defendant Sauced El Segundo, Defendant Sauced Irvine, Defendant Sauced
13 Livermore, Defendant Sauced Sacramento, Defendant Sauced Santana Row and Defendant
14 Sauced Walnut Creek are therefore alter egos of each other. Adherence to the fiction of the
15 separate existence of DEFENDANT would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege, and would
16 promote injustice by protecting DEFENDANT from liability for the wrongful acts committed by
17 them.

18 9. PLAINTIFF further alleges that DEFENDANT are the alter egos of each other for
19 the following reasons:

- 20 a. On the California Secretary of State’s website (<https://businesssearch.sos.ca.gov/>)
21 Defendant Sauced El Segundo, Defendant Sauced Irvine, Defendant Sauced
22 Livermore, Defendant Sauced Sacramento, Defendant Sauced Santana Row and
23 Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek have the same entity address and/or mailing
24 address and/or Agent for Service of Process;
- 25 b. On information and belief Defendant Sauced El Segundo, Defendant Sauced
26 Irvine, Defendant Sauced Livermore, Defendant Sauced Sacramento, Defendant
27 Sauced Santana Row and Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek utilize the same
28 standardized employment forms and issue the same employment policies and same
pay stubs;

1 c. On information and belief Defendant Sourced El Segundo, Defendant Sourced
2 Irvine, Defendant Sourced Livermore, Defendant Sourced Sacramento, Defendant
3 Sourced Santana Row and Defendant Sourced Walnut Creek have an executive team
4 which supervise and manage the operations of all of DEFENDANT's restaurants,
5 supervised and managed the finances of all of DEFENDANT's restaurants,
6 supervised and managed the marketing of all of DEFENDANT's restaurants,
7 supervised and managed the human resources of all of DEFENDANT's
8 restaurants, and supervised and managed the food and beverage offerings at all of
9 DEFENDANT's restaurants.

10 10. PLAINTIFF alleges that DEFENDANT's various separate corporate entities are
11 used by an individual or individuals, or by another corporation, to accomplish inequitable
12 purposes, including to limit liability for the unlawful acts of DEFENDANT.

13 11. PLAINTIFF alleges that there is such a unity of interest and ownership between
14 DEFENDANT's various corporate entities that own DEFENDANT's restaurants and the
15 individual or individuals, or organization controlling those corporate entities that their separate
16 personalities no longer exist.

17 12. PLAINTIFF further alleges that the failure to disregard the various corporate
18 entities would promote injustice.

19 13. Defendant Sourced El Segundo, Defendant Sourced Irvine, Defendant Sourced
20 Livermore, Defendant Sourced Sacramento, Defendant Sourced Santana Row and Defendant
21 Sourced Walnut Creek were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents
22 issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively and are
23 therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as "DEFENDANTS"
24 and/or "DEFENDANT."

25 14. DEFENDANTS own, operate, and/or manage Sourced BBQ & Spirits restaurants
26 throughout the state of California, including in the county of Los Angeles, where PLAINTIFF
27 worked.

28 15. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from August of 2022
to March of 2023 as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis and entitled to the legally

1 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
2 worked.

3 16. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of herself and a California class,
4 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Suced El Segundo
5 and/or Defendant Suced Irvine and/or Defendant Suced Livermore and/or Defendant Suced
6 Sacramento and/or Defendant Suced Santana Row and/or Defendant Suced Walnut Creek in
7 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time
8 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
9 date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the
10 aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars
11 (\$5,000,000.00).

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

23 18. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
24 partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
25 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANTS by such fictitious
26 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this
27 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are
28 ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief

1 alleges, that the DEFENDANTS named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50,
2 inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that
3 proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

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

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

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

26 23. PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS seek an injunction
27 enjoining such conduct by DEFENDANT in the future, relief for the named PLAINTIFF and
28 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS who has been economically injured by

1 DEFENDANT's past and current unlawful conduct, and all other appropriate legal and equitable
2 relief.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

12 **THE CONDUCT**

13 26. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the
14 requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a
15 matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically
16 failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate
17 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for missed meal and rest
18 periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all
19 time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
20 for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other
22 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse
23 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for business expenses, and failed to issue
24 to PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS with accurate itemized wage
25 statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
26 periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANT's
27 uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment
28 for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANT to illegally profit

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

4 **A. Meal Period Violations**

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

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

1 duty” meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call.
3 DEFENDANT’s failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with
4 legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records. PLAINTIFF and
5 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional
6 compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’s strict corporate policy and practice.

7 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

22 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

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

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

19 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

28 ///

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

9 34. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT, from time to time, failed to provide
10 PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with wage statements that comply with
11 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

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

17 36. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT failed and
18 continues to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 for all hours worked.

20 37. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required
21 PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift
22 work, including but not limited to, performing security sweeps of DEFENDANT's restaurant,
23 cleaning and closing up the restaurant. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

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

27 ///
28

1 39. DEFENDANT controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications,
2 assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
3 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

4 40. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other
5 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to
6 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
7 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

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

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

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

26 45. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed and
27 continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS
28 Members for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and

1 redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
2 forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime
3 and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates.
4 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at
5 the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and
6 redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
7 records.

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

12 47. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
13 Members' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid
14 PLAINTIFF and other CLASS MEMBERS incentive wages based on their performance for
15 DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly
16 basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by
17 DEFENDANTS.

18 48. However, from-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay
19 periods where PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members worked overtime, double
20 time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-
21 discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus
22 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked
23 rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the
24 incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
25 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA
26 CLASS members must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted
27 in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period
28 premiums, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS members by

1 DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time
2 for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the
3 workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee
4 actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as articulated herein, by
5 failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of
6 sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is
7 recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

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

19 **G. Unlawful Rounding Violations**

20 50. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT did not have in place
21 an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for the actual time these employees worked each day, including
23 overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANT had in place an unlawful rounding policy and
24 practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members being
25 undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in
26 fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system
27 for PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these
28 employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime

1 worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF, and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, from time to time,
2 forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately
3 recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

4 51. Further, the mutability of DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system and unlawful
5 rounding policy and practice resulted in PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members' time
6 being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, DEFENDANT'S unlawful rounding
7 policy and practice caused PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work
8 as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-
9 duty meal break. Additionally, DEFENDANT'S unlawful rounding policy and practice caused
10 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT
11 for more than ten (10) hours during a shift without receiving a second off-duty meal break.

12 **H. Timekeeping Manipulation**

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

22 53. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
23 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
24 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

25 54. The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed DEFENDANTS to alter
26 employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in DEFENDANTS'
27 timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that PLAINTIFF and other members of the
28 CALIFORNIA CLASS clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees

1 were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of
2 DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30)
3 minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks.

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

10 **I. Sick Pay Violations**

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

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

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

23 58. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
24 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
25 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
26 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
27 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.
28

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

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

12 **K. Tip Pooling**

13 61. During the CALIFORNIA CLASS period, pursuant to DEFENDANTS’ company
14 policies and practices, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to
15 forfeit gratuities left for them by customers to DEFENDANTS’ agents who provided no service
16 to the customers that resulted in the gratuity. DEFENDANTS routinely added gratuity tips and
17 service charges to its food and beverage bills. These gratuities and service charges reasonably
18 appear to be gratuities for the service staff. It is typical and customary in the hospitality industry
19 that establishments impose gratuity charges on the food and beverage bill. Thus, when customers
20 paid these charges, it is reasonable for them to have believed they were gratuities to be paid to the
21 service staff. Indeed, because many of these charges are depicted to customers, and the custom in
22 the food and beverage industry that gratuities are paid for food and beverage service, customers
23 paid these charges reasonably believing they were remitted to the service staff. However,
24 DEFENDANTS have not remitted the total proceeds of these gratuities to the non-managerial
25 employees who serve the food and beverages. Instead, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice
26 of using a portion of these gratuities to pay managers or other non-service employees. As a result,
27 PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have not received the total proceeds of the
28 gratuities, to which they are entitled to under California law.

1 62. DEFENDANTS are generally in the business of owning and operating a restaurant.
2 During the CALIFORNIA CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
3 Members were in the “chain of service” and earned gratuities based on their service for their
4 customers. However, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were forced to forfeit
5 portions of their gratuities, which said gratuities were kept by DEFENDANTS’ employees who
6 were not in the chain of service from which the gratuity resulted. PLAINTIFF and other
7 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members contend that any gratuities kept by DEFENDANTS’ non-
8 service employees were illegal and in violation of California law because PLAINTIFF and other
9 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members provided the service for to whom the gratuity should have been
10 paid.

11 63. California Labor Code § 351 establishes the requirements for an employer
12 regarding the payment of gratuities. Specifically, gratuities are the sole property of the employees.
13 California Labor Code § 351 expressly prohibits employers and their agents from collecting,
14 taking, or receiving any portion of a gratuity. California Labor Code § 350(e) defines the term
15 “gratuity” as including any money that has been paid or given or left for an employee by a patron
16 of a business over and above the actual amount due the business for services rendered or for
17 goods, food, drink or articles sold or served to such patron. Labor Code § 353 requires employers
18 to keep accurate records of all gratuities they receive, directly or indirectly.

19 64. Although tip pooling is not expressly prohibited by the Labor Code, employees
20 who mandate tip pooling must only distribute pooled tips to employees in the “chain of service.”
21 By distributing tips to employees who were not in the “chain of service,” DEFENDANTS have
22 violated and continue to violate the legal requirements for handling pooled tips.

23 65. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take
24 off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods.
25 PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5)
26 hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to
27 provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required
28 by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANT provided PLAINTIFF

1 with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break.
2 DEFENDANT policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was
3 supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks
4 without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT’S strict corporate policy
5 and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANT also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to
6 comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANT failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for
7 required business expenses related to the use of her personal cell phone, in violation of Cal. Lab.
8 Code § 2802. To date, DEFENDANT has not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and
9 double time compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab.
10 Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or
11 value of \$75,000.

12 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

13 66. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of herself, and a California class
14 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant Sauced El Segundo
15 and/or Defendant Sauced Irvine and/or Defendant Sauced Livermore and/or Defendant Sauced
16 Sacramento and/or Defendant Sauced Santana Row and/or Defendant Sauced Walnut Creek in
17 California and classified as non-exempt employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time
18 during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the
19 date as determined by the Court (the “CLASS PERIOD”).

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

26 68. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
27 impractical.
28

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

- a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and practices;
- b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and practices;
- c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members accurate overtime wages;
- e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for all time worked;
- i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members, even though DEFENDANT enjoyed the benefit

1 of this work, required employees to perform this work and permits or suffers to
2 permit this work;

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

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

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

10 72. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

12 73. PLAINTIFF retained able class counsel with extensive experience in class action
13 litigation.

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

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

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

23 77. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
24 adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all class members is impractical. Moreover,
25 since the damages suffered by individual members of the class may be relatively small, the
26 expense and burden of individual litigation makes it practically impossible for the members of the
27 class individually to redress the wrongs done to them. Without class certification and
28 determination of declaratory, injunctive, statutory, and other legal questions within the class

1 format, prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS will
2 create the risk of:

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

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

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **Unlawful Business Practices**

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

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

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

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

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

26 Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may
27 be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. The court may make such orders or
28 judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the
use or employment by any person of any practice which constitutes unfair competition, as
defined in this chapter, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any

1 money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of such
2 unfair competition. (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203).

3 82. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT has engaged and continues to
4 engage in a business practice which violates California law, including but not limited to, the
5 applicable Wage Order(s), the California Code of Regulations and the California Labor Code
6 including Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and
7 2802, for which this Court should issue declaratory and other equitable relief pursuant to Cal.
8 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 as may be necessary to prevent and remedy the conduct held to
9 constitute unfair competition, including restitution of wages wrongfully withheld.

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

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

24 85. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unlawful,
25 unfair, and deceptive in that DEFENDANT's employment practices caused PLAINTIFF and the
26 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to be underpaid during their employment with
27 DEFENDANT.

28 86. By the conduct alleged herein, DEFENDANT's practices were also unfair and
deceptive in that DEFENDANT's uniform policies, practices and procedures failed to provide

1 mandatory meal and/or rest breaks to PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members as
2 required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

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

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

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

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

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

27 92. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS are further
28 entitled to, and do, seek a declaration that the described business practices are unlawful, unfair,

1 and deceptive, and that injunctive relief should be issued restraining DEFENDANT from
2 engaging in any unlawful and unfair business practices in the future.

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

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Failure To Pay Minimum Wages**

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

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

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

17 95. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
18 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
19 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to accurately calculate and pay
20 minimum wages to PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

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

1 99. DEFENDANT maintained a uniform wage practice of paying PLAINTIFF and the
2 other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS without regard to the correct amount of time they
3 work. As set forth herein, DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice was to unlawfully and
4 intentionally deny timely payment of wages due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS.

6 100. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
7 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
8 implementing a uniform policy and practice that denies accurate compensation to PLAINTIFF
9 and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in regard to minimum wage pay.

10 101. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
11 inaccurately calculated the correct time worked and consequently underpaid the actual time
12 worked by PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS. DEFENDANT acted
13 in an illegal attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of
14 the California Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable
15 laws and regulations.

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

19 103. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
20 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for time worked that they were entitled to, constituting a
21 failure to pay all earned wages.

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

27 105. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the other
28 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were under-compensated for their time worked.

1 DEFENDANT systematically elected, either through intentional malfeasance or gross
2 nonfeasance, to not pay employees for their labor as a matter of uniform company policy, practice
3 and procedure, and DEFENDANT perpetrated this systematic scheme by refusing to pay
4 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS the correct minimum wages
5 for their time worked.

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

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

25
26
27
28 ///

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

5 108. 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.

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

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

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

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

22 113. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
23 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time
24 they worked, including overtime work.

25 114. DEFENDANT's uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested,
26 without limitation, applicable to the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a whole, as a result of
27 implementing a uniform policy and practice that failed to accurately record overtime worked by
28 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members and denied accurate compensation to

1 PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS for overtime worked,
2 including, the overtime work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or twelve
3 (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

4 115. In committing these violations of the California Labor Code, DEFENDANT
5 inaccurately recorded overtime worked and consequently underpaid the overtime worked by
6 PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members. DEFENDANT acted in an illegal
7 attempt to avoid the payment of all earned wages, and other benefits in violation of the California
8 Labor Code, the Industrial Welfare Commission requirements and other applicable laws and
9 regulations.

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

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

21 118. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS were paid less for overtime worked that they were entitled to, constituting
23 a failure to pay all earned wages.

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

1 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
2 witnessed by employees.

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

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

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

23 123. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
24 request recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
25 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
26 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is
27 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their
28 employment, DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore

1 these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
2 penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional,
3 and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are
4 entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

7 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

26 126. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
27 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
28 who were not provided a meal period, in accordance with the applicable Wage Order, one

1 additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a
2 meal period was not provided.

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

6 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods**

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

27 130. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable
28 IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members

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

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

7 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

9 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

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

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

15 An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or
16 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her
17 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.

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

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

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

12 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

14 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

19 137. Cal. Lab. Code § 200 provides that:

20 As used in this article:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

28 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

144. 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.

145. 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.

146. 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.

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

4 148. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
5 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
6 CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct
7 wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not
8 properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
9 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover
10 liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation
11 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
12 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
13 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
14 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

15 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO PAY STATUTORY GRATUITIES**

17 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 351 et seq.)**

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

19 **Defendants)**

20 149. 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.

23 150. DEFENDANT's conduct, as set forth above, in failing to remit to non-managerial
24 employees the total proceeds of gratuities added to customers' bills constitutes a violation of
25 California Labor Code Section 351. This violation is enforceable pursuant to the California Unfair
26 Competition Law, Cal. Bus. And Prof. Code 17200 et seq. DEFENDANT's conduct constitutes
27 unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent business acts or practices, in that DEFENDANT has violated
28

1 California Labor Code Section 351 in not remitting to the non-managerial service employees the
2 total gratuities that were charged to customers.

3 151. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF and
4 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at trial,
5 including the loss of gratuities to which they were entitled. and seek all wages earned and due,
6 interest, penalties, expenses and costs of suit.

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

10 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

21 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

- 22 a. That the Court certify the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth
23 Causes of Action asserted by the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a class action pursuant
24 to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 382;
25 b. Compensatory damages, according to proof at trial, including compensatory
26 damages for overtime compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the other members of
27 the CALIFORNIA CLASS, during the applicable CLASS PERIOD plus interest
28 thereon at the statutory rate;

- 1 c. Meal and rest period compensation pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and
2 the applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 3 d. The greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in
4 which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per each member of the
5 CALIFORNIA CLASS for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding
6 an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and an award of costs for
7 violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226.
- 8 e. The wages of all terminated employees from the CALIFORNIA CLASS as a
9 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action
10 therefore is commenced, in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 203.
- 11 f. The amount of the expenses PLAINTIFF and each member of the CALIFORNIA
12 CLASS incurred in the course of their job duties, plus interest, and costs of suit.
- 13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

///

1 3. On all claims:

- 2 a. An award of interest, including prejudgment interest at the legal rate;
- 3 b. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable; and
- 4 c. An award of penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit, as allowable under the law,
- 5 including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code § 218.5, § 226, and/or § 1194.
- 6

7 DATED: August 11, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

9 By: 

10 Shani O. Zakay
11 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

12
13 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

15
16

17 DATED: August 11, 2023

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

18
19 By: 

20 Shani O. Zakay
21 Attorney for PLAINTIFF

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

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

1. Article Addressed to:

Sauced bbq
2121 N California Blvd
Ste 875
Walnut Creek, CA 94596



9590 9402 8150 3030 4582 14

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 0880 7025 72

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

Kerita A

C. Date of Delivery

8/7/27

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

002-536

8/11

Taranto v. Sauced

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery

☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery☐ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Mail

Mail Restricted Delivery

(00)

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

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

1. Article Addressed to:

Sauced bbq - Livermore
2300 First Street
Ste 220
Livermore, CA 94550



9590 9402 8150 3030 4582 21

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 0880 7025 65

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X Liliane Gomes

☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

Diane Gomes

C. Date of Delivery

8-14-23

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

002-536

8/11

Taranto v. Sauced

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery

☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery☐ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Mail

Mail Restricted Delivery

(00)

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt