Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Riverside on 12/05/2025 09:48 PM
Case Number CVRI2507152 0000150371758 - Jason B. Galkin, Executive Officer/Clerk of the Court By Janelle Blackwell, Clerk

SUM-100

SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)

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

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):
ASBURY AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, INC., a Delaware corporation; ASBURY MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; (See Additional Parties Attachment)

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):
YALILTH DUARTE, on behalf of the State of California in his representative capacity as a private attorney general,

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

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

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (*www.lawhelpcalifornia.org*), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (*www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp*), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of $10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

***¡AVISO!** Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.*

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

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

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Riverside Superior Court
Riverside Historic Courthouse - 4050 Main Street, Riverside, CA 92501

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):
CVRI2507152

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Nicole Noursamadi, Esq. T: (619) 255-9047 Zakay Law Group, APLC - 5440 Morehouse Drive. Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121

DATE: 12/5/2025 *(Fecha)*   Clerk, by *(Secretario)* J Blackwell, Deputy *(Adjunto)*

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons *(form POS-010).)*
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, *(POS-010)).*

[SEAL] GC68150(g)

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served
1. ☐ as an individual defendant.
2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of *(specify):*
3. ☐ on behalf of *(specify):*
   under: ☐ CCP 416.10 (corporation) ☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)
   ☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) ☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
   ☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) ☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
   ☐ other *(specify):*
4. ☐ by personal delivery on *(date)*:

SHORT TITLE: Duarte v. Asbury Automotive Group, Inc., et al.	CASE NUMBER: CVRI2507152

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

- This form may be used as an attachment to any summons if space does not permit the listing of all parties on the summons.
- If this attachment is used, insert the following statement in the plaintiff or defendant box on the summons: "Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

List additional parties *(Check only one box. Use a separate page for each type of party.)*:

☐ Plaintiff ☒ Defendant ☐ Cross-Complainant ☐ Cross-Defendant

LHM TSD, LLC, a Utah limited liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use
Judicial Council of California
SUM-200(A) [Rev. January 1, 2007]

ADDITIONAL PARTIES ATTACHMENT
Attachment to Summons

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
shani@zakaylaw.com
Eden Zakay (State Bar #339536)
eden@zakaylaw.com
Nicole Noursamadi (State Bar #357246)
nicole@zakaylaw.com
Jennifer Gerstenzang (State Bar #279810)
jenny@zakaylaw.com
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047

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

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

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

Plaintiff,

v.

ASBURY AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, INC., a Delaware corporation; ASBURY MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; LHM TSD, LLC, a Utah limited liability company; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: CVRI2507152

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

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

PLAINTIFF YALILTH DUARTE ("PLAINTIFF"), an individual, in PLAINTIFF'S representative capacity and on behalf of PLAINTIFF, the people of the State of California, and as an "aggrieved employee" acting as a private attorney general under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* ("PAGA") only, alleges on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

INTRODUCTION

1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against ASBURY AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, INC.; ASBURY MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC; and LHM TSD, LLC, ("DEFENDANT" and/or "DEFENDANTS") seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699**. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

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

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

4. PLAINTIFF brings this representative action pursuant to PAGA on behalf of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and other current and former aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS for engaging in a pattern and practice of wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code.

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

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

a. Failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods;

b. Failure to allow employees to take duty-free meal and rest periods;

c. Failure to pay all minimum, sick pay, regular and overtime wages;

d. Failure to correctly calculate the regular rate of pay;

e. Failure to pay within seven (7) days of the close of payroll;

f. Failure to pay for all hours worked;

g. Failure to maintain true and accurate records;

h. Failure to reimburse for required business expenses;

i. Failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and

j. Failure to timely pay wages due during, and upon termination of employment.

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

THE PARTIES

8. Defendant ASBURY AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, INC. ("Defendant Asbury Automotive") is a Delaware corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

9. Defendant ASBURY MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC ("Defendant Asbury Management") is a Delaware limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

10. Defendant LHM TSD, LLC ("Defendant LHM") is a Utah limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

11. Defendant Asbury Automotive, Defendant Asbury Management, and Defendant LHM were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, by the company PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES performed work for respectively,

and as these entities each exerted control over the hours, wages and/or working conditions of PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Therefore, Defendant Asbury Automotive, Defendant Asbury Management, and Defendant LHM are jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein as "DEFENDANTS" and/or "DEFENDANT."

12. DEFENDANTS were the employer of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by the documents issued to PLAINTIFF and by the company PLAINTIFF performed work for.

13. DEFENDANTS operate car dealerships throughout the state of California, including in the county of Riverside.

14. PLAINTIFF has been employed by DEFENDANTS in California since August of 2024, paid in part commission-based compensation, non-discretionary bonuses, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

15. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to himself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendant Asbury Automotive and/or Defendant Asbury Management and/or Defendant LHM in California and classified as non-exempt, exempt, piece-rate based, and/or commission-based employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of September 30, 2024, and the present ("PAGA Period").

16. PLAINTIFF is an "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE" within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699(c) because she was employed by DEFENDANT and personally suffered each of the alleged Labor Code violations committed by DEFENDANT.

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

18. Each of the fictitiously named defendants participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint. The true names and capacities of the Defendants named as DOES 1 THROUGH 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF. PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint, setting

forth the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named Defendants when their true names are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitious Defendants have participated in the acts alleged in this Complaint.

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

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

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203. This Court has jurisdiction over AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' claims for civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §2698, *et seq*.

22. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395 and 395.5, because DEFENDANTS (i) currently maintain and at all relevant times maintained offices and facilities in this County and/or conduct substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

THE CONDUCT

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

matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, failed compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for off-the-clock work, failed to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES meal rest premiums at the regular rate, failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses, and knowingly and intentionally failed to issue to PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. DEFENDANTS' uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES against DEFENDANTS, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

A. <u>Meal Period Violations</u>

24. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS were required to pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANTS' control. Specifically, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days when PLAINTIFF did not even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and

overtime rates. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

25. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, as a result of their rigorous work schedules and DEFENDANT's inadequate staffing practices, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which DEFENDANTS require these employees to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty meal breaks. DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's strict corporate policy and practice.

B. <u>Rest Period Violations</u>

26. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES 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 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and/or on call. Further, DEFENDANTS from time to time required PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to maintain cordless communication devices in order to receive and respond to work-related communications during what was supposed to be their off-duty rest breaks. PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES 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 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers.

C. <u>Unreimbursed Business Expenses</u>

27. DEFENDANTS as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES 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 employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

28. In the course of their employment, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell phones and for the purchase and maintenance of work uniforms as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to

use their own cell phones and purchase and maintain their work uniforms in order to perform work related tasks. However, DEFENDANTS unlawfully failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the personal expenses incurred for the use of their personal cell phones and purchase and maintenance of their work uniforms. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cell phones and purchase and maintenance of their work uniforms, all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS.

D. <u>Wage Statement Violations</u>

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

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

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

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

E. <u>Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations</u>

33. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked.

34. During the PAGA PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including but not limited to, sending and receiving work-related communications, clocking in and out, and performing keyholder duties. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES having to work while off-the-clock.

35. DEFENDANTS directed and directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-clock work performed by PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

36. DEFENDANTS controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications, assignments, and employment conditions of PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

37. DEFENDANTS were able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES spent working; however, DEFENDANTS failed to document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

40. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law.

41. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control, and benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice to not pay PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

F. <u>Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums, and Redeemed Sick Pay</u>

42. From time to time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed and continues to fail to accurately calculate and pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES Members at the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

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

44. The second component of PLAINTIFF'S and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' compensation was DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' incentive wages based on their performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly

basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by DEFENDANTS.

45. From-time-to-time, when calculating the regular rate of pay, in those pay periods where PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked overtime, double time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-discretionary bonus, DEFENDANTS failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANTS. Specifically, California Labor Code Section 246 mandates that paid sick time for non-employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the non-exempt employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek. DEFENDANTS' conduct, as articulated herein, by failing to include the incentive compensation as part of the "regular rate of pay" for purposes of sick pay compensation was in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 246 the underpayment of which is recoverable under Cal. Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203 and/or 204.

46. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the correct rate of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay. This uniform policy and practice of DEFENDANTS is intended to purposefully avoid the payment of the correct overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay as required by California law which allowed DEFENDANTS to illegally profit and gain an unfair

advantage over competitors who complied with the law. To the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES members against DEFENDANTS, the PAGA PERIOD should be adjusted accordingly.

G. <u>Commission and Piece-Rate Violations</u>

47. From time-to-time during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid in part on a commission and/or piece-rate basis. In those instances where PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid in part on a commission and/or piece-rate basis, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to be separately compensated for all non-productive time at an hourly rate that is no less than the applicable minimum wage. Notwithstanding, in those instances where PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid in part on a commission and/or piece-rate basis, DEFENDANTS failed to separately compensate PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all non-productive time, including but not limited to, paid rest periods, at an hourly rate that is no less than the applicable minimum wage. As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited minimum wages and overtime wages by DEFENDANT'S failure to separately compensate their non-productive time at an hourly rate that is no less than the applicable minimum wage.

48. Further, from time-to-time during the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS improperly misclassified PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who were paid on a draw versus commission basis as exempt from overtime compensation. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANTS included advanced draws in order to meet the salary-basis test for the overtime exemption. However, DEFENDANTS cannot rely on advanced draws in order to meet the salary-basis test for such an exemption. (See *Semprini v. Wedbush* (2020) 57 Cal.App.5th 252-254.) As a result, PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who were paid on a draw versus commission basis forfeited overtime wages by DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately classify them as non-exempt from overtime compensation.

H. <u>Sick Pay Violations</u>

49. Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that "An employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from

the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section." Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From time to time, DEFENDANTS failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with sick days and/or paid sick leave. As of January 1, 2024, DEFENDANTS failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide and allow employees to use at least forty hours or five days of paid sick leave per year.

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

I. <u>Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages</u>

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

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

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

J. Unlawful Deductions

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

K. Unlawful Rounding Practices

55. During the PAGA Period, DEFENDANTS did not have in place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual time these employees worked each day, including overtime hours. Specifically, DEFENDANTS had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice that resulted in PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES being undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, DEFENDANTS were able to and did in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in DEFENDANT'S timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in order to avoid paying these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, from time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

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

L. Timekeeping Manipulation

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

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

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

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

61. Specifically, as to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF was from time to time unable to take off duty meal and rest breaks and was not fully relieved of duty for her rest and meal periods. PLAINTIFF was required to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANTS for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break. Further, DEFENDANT failed to

provide PLAINTIFF with a second off-duty meal period each workday in which she was required by DEFENDANTS to work ten (10) hours of work. When DEFENDANTS provided PLAINTIFF with a rest break, they required PLAINTIFF to remain on-duty and on-call for the rest break. DEFENDANTS policy caused PLAINTIFF to remain on-call and on-duty during what was supposed to be her off-duty meal periods. PLAINTIFF therefore forfeited meal and rest breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT'S strict corporate policy and practice. Moreover, DEFENDANTS also provided PLAINTIFF with paystubs that failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, DEFENDANTS also failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for required business expenses related to the personal expenses incurred for the use of his personal cell phone, and purchase and maintenance of work uniforms, on behalf of and in furtherance of her employment with DEFENDANTS. To date, DEFENDANTS have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to him or any penalty wages owed to him under Cal. Lab. Code § 203. The amount in controversy for PLAINTIFF individually does not exceed the sum or value of $75,000.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(Cal. Lab. Code §§2698 et seq.)

(Alleged by PLAINTIFF against all Defendants)

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

63. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as

private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." (Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1.) Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

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

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

66. PLAINTIFF complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in Labor Code Section 2699.3. By certified letter, return receipt requested, dated September 30, 2025, PLAINTIFF gave written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and to DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. (See Exhibit #1.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

f. For violations of Labor Code Sections 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198 and 1199, a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars fifty ($250) for each AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE per pay period for each subsequent violation [penalty per Labor Code Section 1197.1].

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

/ / /

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

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

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

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

DATED: December 5, 2025

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: Nicole Noursamadi

Nicole Noursamadi, Esq.
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

EXHIBIT 1

Client # 102701 **September 30, 2025**

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

ASBURY AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, INC.
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento CA 95833
Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 2308 6687 50

ASBURY MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento CA 95833
Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 2308 6687 36

LHM TSD, LLC
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento CA 95833
Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 2308 6687 43

VA TLG, LLC
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento CA 95833
Sent via Certified Mail and Return Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 1166 8818 37

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

Dear Sir/Madam:

This notice is being sent in compliance with Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3. Our offices represent Plaintiff YALILTH DUARTE ("Plaintiff") and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant ASBURY AUTOMOTIVE GROUP, INC. ("Defendant Asbury Automotive"), Defendant ASBURY MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC ("Defendant Asbury Management"), Defendant LHM TSD, LLC ("Defendant LHM"), and Defendant VA TLG, LLC ("Defendant VA TLG") (hereinafter, collectively "Defendants") since August of 2024 as a sales manager and worked at Defendants' car dealership at 6800 Federal Boulevard, Lemon Grove, CA 91945. Plaintiff has been paid by Defendants in part by commission-based compensation, non-discretionary bonuses, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked

Plaintiff alleges that within the past year, Plaintiff personally suffered violations of the following Labor Code Sections as a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff for all time worked, provide Plaintiff with compliant meal periods, provide Plaintiff with compliant rest periods, provide Plaintiff with accurate itemized wage statements that facially comply with the requirements provided for in Labor Code Section 226, furnish wages to Plaintiff with the frequency as set forth under Labor Code Section 204, and reimburse Plaintiff for necessary business expenses pursuant to Labor Code Sections 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804. These violations are actionable under California Labor Code Section 2699.3.

The information below provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

Plaintiff seeks to represent a group of aggrieved employees defined as any person currently or formerly employed by Defendant Asbury Automotive and/or Defendant Asbury Management and/or Defendant LHM and/or Defendant VA TLG who performed work in California and against whom one or more of the alleged violations listed above were committed during the relevant claim period ("Aggrieved Employees"). Plaintiff believes this group to be comprised of all current and former non-exempt, exempt, piece-rate based, and/or commission-based employees who performed work for Defendant Asbury Automotive and/or Defendant Asbury Management and/or Defendant LHM and/or Defendant VA TLG in California during the period beginning one year prior to the date of this Notice and continuing through the present.

In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, Defendants as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to provide legally compliant meal and rest periods, failed to accurately compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked, failed compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for off-the-clock work, failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees overtime at the correct regular rate of pay, failed to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees meal and rest premiums at the regular rate of pay, failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees redeemed sick pay at the regular rate of pay, failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for business expenses, and failed to issue to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees accurate itemized wage statements showing, among other things, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay periods and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. Defendants' uniform policies and practices are intended to purposefully avoid the accurate and full payment for all time worked as required by California law which allows Defendants to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who comply with the law.

Meal Period Violations: Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the last year, Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to work without paying them for all the time they were under Defendants' control. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be Plaintiff's off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where Plaintiff did not even receive a partial lunch. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime rates. Defendants' uniform policy and practice not to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

During the last year, as a result of their rigorous work schedules and Defendants' inadequate staffing practices, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work as ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were required by Defendants to work ten (10) hours of work. The nature of the work performed by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees does not qualify for the limited and narrowly construed "on-duty" meal period exception. When they were provided with meal periods, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were, from time to time, required to remain on duty and on call. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with legally required meal breaks is evidenced by Defendants' business records. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and Defendants' inadequate staffing, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees therefore forfeited meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with Defendants' strict corporate policy and practice.

Rest Period Violations: From time to time during the past year, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees 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 Defendants' 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 Aggrieved Employees were, from time to time, required to remain on premises, on duty and/or on call, and not fully relieved of all duties. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were also not provided with one-hour wages in lieu thereof. As a result of their rigorous work schedules and Defendants' inadequate staffing, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were from time to time denied their proper rest periods by Defendants and Defendants' managers.

Unreimbursed Business Expenses: Defendants as a matter of corporate policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally, knowingly, and systematically failed to reimburse and indemnify the Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for required business expenses incurred by the Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in direct consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of Defendants. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

Within the last year, in the course of their employment, Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell phones and for the purchase and maintenance of their work uniforms as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties. Specifically, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were required to incur personal expenses for the use of their personal cell phones and the purchase and maintenance of their work uniforms in order to perform work related tasks. However, Defendants unlawfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the personal expenses incurred for the for the use of their personal cell phones and the purchase and maintenance of their work uniforms. As a result, in the course of their employment with Defendants, the Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees incurred unreimbursed business expenses that included, but were not limited to, costs related to the personal expenses incurred for the for the use of their personal cell phones and purchase and maintenance of their work uniforms, all on behalf of and for the benefit of Defendants. For example, during the pay period of April 1, 2025 to April 15, 2025, Defendants required Plaintiff to use Plaintiff's personal cell phone and incur personal expenses for the purchase and maintenance of Plaintiff's work uniform. However, as evidenced by the example below, Defendants failed to fully reimburse Plaintiff for the use of Plaintiff's personal cell phone and failed to reimburse for the purchase and maintenance of his work uniform.

ASBURY
AUTOMOTIVE GROUP

Employer Name:	Asbury Management Services LLC	Employee Name:	Yalilth Duarte	Pay Date:	4/22/2025
Employer Phone:	1-770-418-8200	Employee #:	3104055	Pay Period:	4/1/2025 - 4/15/2025
Employer Address:	2905 Premiere Parkway Suite 300 Duluth, GA 30097	Employee Address:	[redacted]	Check #:	911715412
				Pay Frequency:	Semi-Monthly
		Site:	596-LHM Toyota Lemon Grove	Pay Rate:	$4,000.00
		State:	CA-LHM	Federal Filing Status:	Single; Exempt
		Department:	B-New/Used Sales (Dealership)	Federal 2c/Extra Withholding:	No/$0.00
		Job Title:	15401-Manager - Sales	State Filing Status:	Single; Exempt (CA)
		Pay Type:	Salary	State Exemptions:	0 (CA)
		Pay Group:	LHM Semi Monthly - CA & WA		

	Current 4/1/2025 - 4/15/2025			YTD As of 4/15/2025	
	Hours/Units	Rate	Amount	Hours/Units	Amount
Earnings			$6,532.36		$36,790.87
Sales Commissio			$2,532.36		$9,790.87
Draw			$4,000.00		$27,000.00
Memo Information			$289.34		$2,314.72
Medical ER			$289.34		$2,314.72
Pre-Tax Deductions			$157.74		$1,261.92
Medical Insurance			$137.07		$1,096.56
Dental Basic			$14.65		$117.20
Vision			$6.02		$48.16
Taxes			$564.14		$4,180.34
Fed W/H					$730.74
FICA EE			$395.22		$2,202.79
Fed MWT EE			$92.43		$515.17
CA W/H					$305.30
CA DT EE			$76.49		$426.34
Post-Tax Deductions			$984.00		$7,872.00
Child Support 1			$982.50		$7,860.00
Child Support 1 - Fees			$1.50		$12.00
Reimbursements			$7.50		$60.00
Cell Phone Reimburse			$7.50		$60.00
	Routing #	Account #	Amount		Amount
Net Pay			$4,833.98		$23,536.61
Check			$4,833.98		

Wage Statement Violations: California Labor Code Section 226 requires an employer to furnish its employees and accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece-rate, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of the employee's social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. From time to time during the last year, when Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees missed meal and rest breaks, or were paid inaccurately for missed meal and rest period premiums, or were not paid for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, all deductions, the total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate, correct rates of pay for penalty payments or missed meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate wage statements that included all required elements listed above. Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, 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. As a result, Defendants issued Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with wage statements that violate Cal. Lab. Code § 226. Further, Defendants' violations are knowing and intentional, were not isolated due to an unintentional payroll error due to clerical or inadvertent mistake.

Off-the-Clock Work Resulting in Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations: During the last year, from time-to-time, Defendants failed and continue to fail to accurately pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. During the last year, from time-to-time Defendants required Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including but not limited to sending and receiving work-related communications, clocking in and out, and performing keyholder duties. This resulted in Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees having to work while off-the-clock. Defendants directly benefited from the undercompensated off-the-clock work performed by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees. Defendants controlled the work schedules, duties, and protocols, applications, assignments, and employment conditions of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

Defendants were able to track the amount of time Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees spent working; however, Defendants failed to document, track, or pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned and owed for all the work they performed. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were non-exempt employees, subject to the requirements of the California Labor Code. Defendants' policies and practices deprived Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees of all minimum regular, overtime, and double time wages owed for the off-the-clock work activities. Because Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees typically worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek, and more than eight (8) hours per day, Defendants' policies and practices also deprived them of overtime pay.

Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff's and other Aggrieved Employees' off-the-clock work was compensable under the law. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at Defendants' direction, control, and benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, undergoing pre-shift and post-shift work. Defendants' uniform policy and practice to not pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

Regular Rate Violation – Overtime, Double Time, Meal and Rest Period Premiums, and Redeemed

Sick Pay: From time to time during the last year, Defendants failed and continue to fail to accurately calculate and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for their overtime and double time hours worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited wages due to them for working overtime without compensation at the correct overtime and double time rates, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay rates. Defendants' uniform policy and practice not to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rate for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and sick pay in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

State law provides that employees must be paid overtime at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that was tied to specific elements of an employee's performance. The second component of Plaintiff's and other Aggrieved Employees' compensation was Defendants' non-discretionary incentive program that paid Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees incentive wages based on their performance for Defendants. The non-discretionary bonus program provided all employees paid on an hourly basis with bonus compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by Defendants. However, from time to time, when calculating the regular rate of pay in those pay periods where Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked overtime, double time, paid meal and rest period premium payments, and/or redeemed sick pay, and earned non-discretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to accurately include the non-discretionary bonus compensation as part of the employee's "regular rate of pay" and/or calculated all hours worked rather than just all non-overtime hours worked. Management and supervisors described the incentive/bonus program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in a systematic underpayment of overtime and double time compensation, meal and rest period premium payments, and redeemed sick pay to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees by Defendants.

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

In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, Defendants as a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, intentionally and knowingly failed to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rate of pay for all overtime and double time worked, meal and rest period premiums, and redeemed sick pay as required by California law which allowed Defendants to illegally profit and gain an unfair advantage over competitors who complied with the law.

Unlawful Deductions: During the last year, Defendants, from time-to-time, unlawfully deducted wages from Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' pay without explanations and without authorization to do so or notice to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code § 221.

Timekeeping Manipulation: During the last year, Defendants, from time-to-time, did not have an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the actual time Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal and rest breaks. As a result, Defendants were able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally alter the time recorded in Defendants' timekeeping system for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in order to avoid paying these employees for all hours worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed rest breaks. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, from time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

The mutability of the timekeeping system also allowed Defendants to alter employee time records by recording fictitious thirty (30) minute meal breaks in Defendants' timekeeping system so as to create the appearance that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees clocked out for thirty (30) minute meal break when in fact the employees were not at all times provided an off-duty meal break. This practice is a direct result of Defendants' uniform policy and practice of denying employees uninterrupted thirty (30) minute off-duty meal breaks each day or otherwise compensate them for missed meal breaks. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at Defendants' direction, control and benefit for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. Defendants' uniform policy and practice to not pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees wages for all hours worked in accordance with applicable law is evidenced by Defendants' business records.

Unlawful Rounding Practices: During the last year, Defendants did not have in place an immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for the actual time these employees worked each day, including overtime hours. Specifically, Defendants had in place an unlawful rounding policy and practice that resulted in Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees being undercompensated for all of their time worked. As a result, Defendants were able to and did in fact unlawfully, and unilaterally round the time recorded in Defendants' timekeeping system for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in order to avoid paying these employees for all their time worked, including the applicable overtime compensation for overtime worked. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, from time to time, forfeited compensation for their time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates.

Further, the mutability of Defendants' timekeeping system and unlawful rounding policy and practice resulted in Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' time being inaccurately recorded. As a result, from time to time, Defendants' unlawful rounding policy and practice caused Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work as ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during a shift without receiving an off-duty meal break.

Untimely Payment of Wages: Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to timely payment of wages during their employment. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, from time to time, did not receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 201, "If an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 202, if an employee quits his or her employment, "his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting." Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were, from time to time, not timely provided the wages earned and unpaid at the time of their discharge and/or at the time of quitting, in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202. To date, Defendants have not fully paid PLAINTIFF the minimum, overtime and double time compensation still owed to her or any penalty wages owed to her under Cal. Lab. Code § 203.

Sick Pay Violations: Cal. Labor Code Section 246 (a)(1) mandates that "An employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days as specified in this section." Further, Cal. Labor Code Sections 246(b)-(d) provide for the sick day accrual requirements. From time to time, including within the last year, Defendants failed to have a policy or practice in place that provided Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with sick days and/or paid sick leave. As of January 1, 2024, Defendants failed to adhere to the law in that they failed to provide and allow employees to use at least 40 hours or five days of paid sick leave per year. California Labor Code Section 246(i) requires an employer to furnish its employees with written wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available. From time to time, including within the last year, Defendants violated Cal. Lab. Code section 246 by failing to furnish Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with wage statements setting forth the amount of paid sick leave available.

Commission and Piece-Rate Violations: During the last year, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were paid in part on a commission and/or piece-rate basis. In those instances where Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were paid in part on a commission and/or piece-rate basis, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be separately compensated for all non-productive time at an hourly rate that is no less than the applicable minimum wage. Notwithstanding, in those instances where Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were paid in part on a commission and/or piece-rate basis, Defendants failed to separately compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for all non-productive time, including but not limited to, paid rest periods, at an hourly rate that is no less than the applicable minimum wage. As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees forfeited minimum wages and overtime wages by Defendants' failure to separately compensate their non-productive time at an hourly rate that is no less than the applicable minimum wage.

Misclassification Violations: During the last year, Defendants improperly misclassified Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees who were paid on a draw versus commission basis as exempt from overtime compensation. During the last year, Defendants included advanced draws in order to meet the salary-basis test for the overtime exemption. However, Defendants cannot rely on advanced draws in order to meet the salary-basis test for such an exemption. (See *Semprini v. Wedbush* (2020) 57 Cal.App.5th 252-254.) As a result, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees who were paid on a draw versus commission basis forfeited overtime wages by Defendants' failure to accurately classify them as non-exempt from overtime compensation. For example, during the pay period of April 16, 2025 to April 30, 2025, Defendants only paid Plaintiff an advanced draw of $4,000.00, which was used to meet the salary-basis test for exemption.

ASBURY AUTOMOTIVE GROUP

Employer Name:	Asbury Management Services LLC	Employee Name:	Yalith Duarte
Employer Phone:	1-770-418-8200	Employee #:	3104055
Employer Address:	2905 Premiere Parkway Suite 300 Duluth, GA 30097	Employee Address:	[redacted]
		Site:	596-LHM Toyota Lemon Grove
		State:	CA-LHM
		Department:	B-New/Used Sales (Dealership)
		Job Title:	15401-Manager - Sales
		Pay Type:	Salary
		Pay Group:	LHM Semi Monthly - CA & WA

Pay Date:	5/7/2025
Pay Period:	4/16/2025 - 4/30/2025
Check #:	911797092
Pay Frequency:	Semi-Monthly
Pay Rate:	$4,000.00
Federal Filing Status:	Single; Exempt
Federal 2c/Extra Withholding:	No/$0.00
State Filing Status:	Single; Exempt (CA)
State Exemptions:	0 (CA)

	Current 4/16/2025 - 4/30/2025			YTD As of 4/30/2025	
	Hours/Units	Rate	Amount	Hours/Units	Amount
Earnings			$4,000.00		$40,790.87
Sales Commissio					$9,790.87
Draw			$4,000.00		$31,000.00
Memo Information			$289.34		$2,604.06
Medical ER			$289.34		$2,604.06
Pre-Tax Deductions			$157.74		$1,419.66
Medical Insurance			$137.07		$1,233.63
Dental Basic			$14.65		$131.85
Vision			$6.02		$54.18
Taxes			$340.05		$4,520.39
Fed W/H					$730.74
FICA EE			$238.23		$2,441.02
Fed MWT EE			$55.71		$570.88
CA W/H					$305.30
CA DT EE			$46.11		$472.45
Post-Tax Deductions			$984.00		$8,856.00
Child Support 1			$982.50		$8,842.50
Child Support 1 - Fees			$1.50		$13.50
Reimbursements			$7.50		$67.50
Cell Phone Reimburse			$7.50		$67.50
	Routing #	Account #	Amount		Amount
Net Pay			$2,525.71		$26,062.32
Check			$2,525.71		

Defendants also include DOES 1-50, the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise, are presently unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. 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, including DOES 1-50, 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 their 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 in compliance with California Labor Code section 2695, *et seq*.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Sincerely,

Nicole Noursamadi

Nicole Noursamadi, Esq.
Attorney for Plaintiff