

1 **BARVIE LAW, APC**
2 Nicole Barvie (State Bar # 282352)
3 550 W B St. Fourth Floor
4 San Diego, CA 92101
5 Telephone: (858) 255-0928
6 Facsimile: (858) 357-8592
7 nicole@barvielaw.com

8 Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN**

11 JOEL ANGEL FERNANDEZ, JR., an
12 individual, and on behalf of himself, and on
13 behalf of all persons similarly situated,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 MOTOR CITY SALES & SERVICE dba
17 MOTOR CITY BUICK GMC, a California
18 corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,

19 Defendants.

Case No: BCV-25-100392

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) UNFAIR COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 *et seq*;
- 2) FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
- 3) FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 510, *et seq*;
- 4) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED MEAL PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 5) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUIRED REST PERIODS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 226.7 & 512 AND THE APPLICABLE IWC WAGE ORDER;
- 6) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR REQUIRED EXPENSES IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 2802;
- 7) FAILURE TO PROVIDE WAGES WHEN DUE IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 201, 202 AND 203;
- 8) FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED STATEMENTS IN VIOLATION OF CAL. LAB. CODE § 226.
- 9) CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE §2699, *ET SEQ.*, FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226(A)-(C), 226.3,

226.7, 227.3, 246, 432, 510, 512, 558, 1174,
1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197,
1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 2698, 2800, 2802,
AND THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF
REGULATIONS

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF JOEL ANGEL FERNANDEZ, JR. ("PLAINTIFF") an individual, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former employees, allege on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

INTRODUCTION

1. DEFENDANT MOTOR CITY SALES & SERVICE dba MOTOR CITY BUICK GMC (collectively "DEFENDANT" and/or "DEFENDANTS") a California limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial and regular business throughout California.

2. PLAINTIFF began his employment by Defendants in and around March 2021 through present as a non-exempt employee, paid an hourly basis and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

3. PLAINTIFF brings this Class Action on behalf of himself and a California class, defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant MOTOR CITY SALES & SERVICE dba MOTOR CITY BUICK GMC in California and classified as non-exempt employees (the "CALIFORNIA CLASS") at any time during the period beginning four (4) years prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the "CLASS PERIOD"). The amount in controversy for the aggregate claim of the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members is under five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).

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

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

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

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

27 7. DEFENDANTS were PLAINTIFF'S employers or persons acting on behalf of the
28 PLAINTIFF'S employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or

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

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

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

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

18 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

THE CONDUCT

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

A. Meal Period Violations

14. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. From time to time during the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members to work without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT’s control. Specifically, DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what was supposed to be

1 PLAINTIFF'S off-duty meal break. Indeed, there were many days where PLAINTIFF did not
2 even receive a partial lunch. As a result, the PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS
3 Members forfeited minimum wage and overtime compensation by regularly working without their
4 time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and
5 overtime rates. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and other
6 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for all time worked is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
7 records.

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

24 **B. Rest Period Violations**

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

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

11 **C. Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

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

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

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

5 **D. Wage Statement Violations**

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

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

22 21. Further, from time to time, DEFENDANT included Holiday, Vacation, and PTO
23 hours into the computation of total hours worked for purposes of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2),
24 notwithstanding the fact that Holiday, Vacation, and PTO hours are not considered hours worked.
25 DEFENDANTS' inclusion of Holiday, Vacation, and PTO hours into the total hours worked in
26 itemized wage statements issued to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
27 violates Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2).
28

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

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

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

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

25. During the CLASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform pre-shift or post-shift work, including but not limited to, time spent inspecting machinery, repairing machinery, conducting temperature checks of meat, and answering work-related communications. This resulted in PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to have to work while off-the-clock.

26. During the CASS PERIOD, from time-to-time DEFENDANT required PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to perform work on the weekends without allowing PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS to clock in.

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

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

29. DEFENDANT was able to track the amount of time PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS spent working; however, DEFENDANT failed to

1 document, track, or pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS all
2 wages earned and owed for all the work they performed.

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

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

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

13 33. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
14 forfeited wages due to them for all hours worked at DEFENDANT's direction, control, and
15 benefit for the time spent working while off-the-clock, including but not limited to, time spent
16 inspecting machinery, repairing machinery, conducting temperature checks of meat, and
17 answering work-related phone calls. DEFENDANT's uniform policy and practice to not pay
18 PLAINTIFF and the members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS wages for all hours worked in
19 accordance with applicable law is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15 **G. Violations for Untimely Payment of Wages**

16 39. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 204, PLAINTIFF and the
17 CALIFORNIA CLASS members were entitled to timely payment of wages during their
18 employment. PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members, from time to time, did not
19 receive payment of all wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages,
20 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages within permissible time period.

21 **H. Unlawful Deductions**

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

26 **I. Timekeeping Manipulation**

27 41. During the CLASS PERIOD, DEFENDANTS, from time-to-time, did not have an
28 immutable timekeeping system to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and other members of

1 the CALIFORNIA CLASS for the actual time PLAINTIFF and other members of the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS worked each day, including regular time, overtime hours, sick pay, meal
3 and rest breaks. As a result, DEFENDANT was able to and did in fact, unlawfully, and unilaterally
4 alter the time recorded in DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for PLAINTIFF and other
5 members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS in order to avoid paying these employees for all hours
6 worked, applicable overtime compensation, applicable sick pay, missed meal breaks and missed
7 rest breaks.

8 42. As a result, PLAINTIFF and other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS, from
9 time-to-time, forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and
10 without compensation at the applicable pay rates.

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

18 44. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 forfeited wages due them for all hours worked at DEFENDANTS' direction, control and benefit
20 for the time the timekeeping system was inoperable. DEFENDANTS' 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 DEFENDANTS' business
23 records.

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

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

13 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

14 46. PLAINTIFF bring this Class Action on behalf of himself, and a California class
15 defined as all persons who are or previously were employed by Defendant MOTOR CITY SALES
16 & SERVICE dba MOTOR CITY BUICK GMC in California and classified as non-exempt
17 employees (the “CALIFORNIA CLASS”) at any time during the period beginning four (4) years
18 prior to the filing of this Complaint and ending on the date as determined by the Court (the
19 “CLASS PERIOD”).

20 47. 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 48. The members of the class are so numerous that joinder of all class members is
27 impractical.
28

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

- 10 a. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant meal period policies and
11 practices;
- 12 b. Whether DEFENDANT maintained legally compliant rest period policies and
13 practices;
- 14 c. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
15 Members accurate premium payments for missed meal and rest periods;
- 16 d. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
17 Members accurate overtime wages;
- 18 e. Whether DEFENDANT failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS
19 Members at least minimum wage for all hours worked;
- 20 f. Whether DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA
21 CLASS Members for required business expenses;
- 22 g. Whether DEFENDANT issued legally compliant wage statements;
- 23 h. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
24 failing to record and pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
25 CLASS for all time worked;
- 26 i. Whether DEFENDANT committed an act of unfair competition by systematically
27 failing to record all meal and rest breaks missed by PLAINTIFF and other
28 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 50. PLAINTIFF are members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS and suffered damages as
7 a result of DEFENDANT's conduct and actions alleged herein.

8 51. 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 52. PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
11 CALIFORNIA CLASS Members.

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

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

16 55. 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 56. 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 57. 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 58. 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 59. 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 60. DEFENDANT is a “person” as that term is defined under Cal. Bus. And Prof.
21 Code § 17021.

22 61. 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 62. 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 63. 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 64. 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 65. 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 66. 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 67. Therefore, PLAINTIFF demands on behalf of himself 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 68. PLAINTIFF further demands on behalf of himself 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 69. 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 70. 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 71. 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 72. 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 73. 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 74. 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 75. 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 76. 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 77. 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 78. 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 79. 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 80. 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 81. 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 82. 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 83. 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 84. 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 85. 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 86. 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 87. 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 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **Failure To Pay Overtime Compensation**

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

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

1 88. 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 89. PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS bring a claim for
5 DEFENDANT's willful and intentional violations of the California Labor Code and the Industrial
6 Welfare Commission requirements for DEFENDANT's failure to pay these employees for all
7 overtime worked, including, work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday, and/or
8 twelve (12) hours in a workday, and/or forty (40) hours in any workweek.

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

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

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

18 93. During the CLASS PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
19 were required by DEFENDANT to work for DEFENDANT and were not paid for all the time
20 they worked, including overtime work.

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

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

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

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

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

21 99. DEFENDANT failed to accurately pay PLAINTIFF and the other members of the
22 CALIFORNIA CLASS overtime wages for the time they worked which was in excess of the
23 maximum hours permissible by law as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, & 1198, even
24 though PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS were regularly required
25 to work, and did in fact work overtime, and did in fact work overtime as to which DEFENDANT
26 failed to accurately record and pay as evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records and
27 witnessed by employees.

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

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

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

21 103. Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS
22 request recovery of overtime wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the
23 assessment of any statutory penalties against DEFENDANT, in a sum as provided by the
24 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes. To the extent overtime compensation is
25 determined to be owed to the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who have terminated their
26 employment, DEFENDANT'S conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore
27 these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 203, which
28 penalties are sought herein. DEFENDANT's conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional,

1 and not in good faith. Further, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members are
2 entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

3 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods**

5 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)**

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

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

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

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

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512)

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

108. 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.

109. From time to time, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were required to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more. 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, PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members were periodically denied their proper rest periods by DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT's managers. In addition, DEFENDANT failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members for their rest periods as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result, DEFENDANT's failure to provide PLAINTIFF and the CALIFORNIA CLASS Members with all the legally required paid rest periods is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

110. DEFENDANT further violated California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and CALIFORNIA CLASS Members who were not provided a rest 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 rest
2 period was not provided.

3 111. 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 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

8 **(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2802)**

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

10 112. 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.

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

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

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

1 Although these expenses were necessary expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF and the
2 CALIFORNIA CLASS members, DEFENDANT failed to indemnify and reimburse PLAINTIFF
3 and the CALIFORNIA CLASS members for these expenses as an employer is required to do
4 under the laws and regulations of California.

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

9 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Failure To Provide Accurate Itemized Statements**

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 226)**

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

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

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

- 18 a. Gross wages earned,
- 19 b. (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose
20 compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of
21 overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the
22 Industrial Welfare Commission,
- 23 c. the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee
24 is paid on a piece-rate basis,
- 25 d. all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee
26 may be aggregated and shown as one item,
- 27 e. net wages earned,
- 28 f. the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,

- 1 g. the name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by
2 January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number of an
3 employee identification number other than social security number may be shown
4 on the itemized statement,
- 5 h. the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and
- 6 i. all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
7 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

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

17 119. Further, from time to time, DEFENDANT included Holiday, Vacation, and PTO
18 hours into the computation of total hours worked for purposes of Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2),
19 notwithstanding the fact that Holiday, Vacation, and PTO hours are not considered hours worked.
20 DEFENDANT's inclusion of Holiday, Vacation, and PTO hours into the total hours worked in
21 itemized wage statements issued to PLAINTIFF and other CALIFORNIA CLASS Members
22 violates Cal. Lab. Code § 226(a)(2)

23 120. In addition to the foregoing, DEFENDANT failed to provide itemized wage
24 statements to PLAINTIFF and members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS that complied with the
25 requirements of California Labor Code Section 226.

26 121. DEFENDANT knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Cal. Lab. Code
27 § 226, causing injury and damages to PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA
28 CLASS. These damages include, but are not limited to, costs expended calculating the correct

1 wages for all missed meal and rest breaks and the amount of employment taxes which were not
2 properly paid to state and federal tax authorities. These damages are difficult to estimate.
3 Therefore, PLAINTIFF and the other members of the CALIFORNIA CLASS may elect to recover
4 liquidated damages of fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which the violation
5 occurred, and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each violation in a subsequent pay period
6 pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 226, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial (but in no
7 event more than four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) for PLAINTIFF and each respective member
8 of the CALIFORNIA CLASS herein).

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Failure To Pay Wages When Due**

11 **(Cal. Lab. Code § 203)**

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

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

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

17 As used in this article:

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

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

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

28 If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period 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.
Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a
72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and

designates a mailing address. The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting.

126. There was no definite term in PLAINTIFF’S or any CALIFORNIA CLASS Members’ employment contract.

127. Cal. Lab. Code § 203 provides:

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

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

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

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act

[Cal. Lab . Code §§ 2698 ET SEQ. (“PAGA”)]

(By PLAINTIFF and Against All DEFENDANTS)

130. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference the previous paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

131. 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 attorney generals to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California

1 Legislature specified that “it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as
2 private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations...”Stats. 2003, ch.
3 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

4 132. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that provides
5 for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
6 (“LWDA”) or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for
7 violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through civil action brought by an
8 aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant
9 to the procedures specified in Labor Code § 2699.3.

10 133. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
11 specifically provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred
12 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred
13 dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent pay period in which
14 Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

15 134. Defendants’ conduct violates numerous Wage Orders and Labor Code sections
16 including, but not limited to, the following:

17 a. Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.* 210, 226(a), 226(a)(8), 226.3,
18 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
19 2800, 2802, 2698 for failure to timely pay all earned wages (including minimum wage and overtime
20 wages) owed to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees during employment and upon separation
21 of employment as herein alleged;

22 b. Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal periods to
23 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees failure to pay premium wages for missed meal periods and
24 herein alleged;

25 c. Violation of Labor Code §226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to Plaintiff and other
26 aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed rest periods as herein alleged;

27 d. Violation of Labor Code §226 for failure to provide accurate itemized wage
28 statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged;

1 e. Violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain accurate and
2 complete records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to
3 aggrieved employees; and

4 f. Violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse Plaintiff and
5 other aggrieved employees as herein alleged.

6 135. Plaintiff is an “AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE” because he was employed by the
7 alleged violator and had one or more of the violations committed against him, and therefore is
8 properly suited to represent the interest of all the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

9 136. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code § 2699.3 as
10 to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself and all other
11 aggrieved employees under PAGA.

12 137. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to
13 recover civil penalties, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code sections
14 cited above.

15 138. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney’s fees and costs incurred
16 herein.

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

20 1. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

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

3 2. On behalf of the CALIFORNIA CLASS:

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

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

- 24 a. Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys
25 General Act of 2004; and
- 26 b. An Award of penalties, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law.

27 4. On all claims:

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

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

5 DATED: January 31, 2025

6 **BARVIE LAW, APC**
7 By: 
8 _____
Nicole Barvie
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

9 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

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

12 DATED: January 31, 2025

13 **BARVIE LAW, APC**
14 By: 
15 _____
Nicole Barvie
Attorney for PLAINTIFF
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28